

thousands of active leaders in different parts of the State, may be purged of any complicity in or countenance of such unworthy tactics."

Congressman REECE, of the first district, gave out the following statement:

"I have no formal statement to give out, but I feel that in the interests of the party and its future there should be an investigation of these reports by the proper tribunal. My district is not locally concerned in the situation, but in the interest of the party in Tennessee we can not afford to pass this matter by unnoticed. In fact, the party welfare demands an investigation, and I hope that such will be held at once."

Congressman BROWN, of the third district, stated as follows:

"I have read the resolution introduced in the Senate by Senator McKELLAR, and some of the newspaper publications. This resolution, of course, has no reference to post offices in the five congressional districts represented in Congress by Republican Congressmen, because Mr. Overall has no connection with the distribution of such patronage in those districts. As I understand, Mr. Overall has been acting as referee and charged with the responsibility of making recommendations with respect to the appointment of postmasters, rural carriers, etc., in the five Democratic congressional districts. It has always been customary for the national committeeman in Tennessee to do this. I can not believe that John Overall has been trading in the post offices or any other kind of offices. John Overall has been many times honored by the Republican Party in Tennessee and has always borne the reputation of an honest man. I am sure that he will welcome an immediate and complete investigation either by the Post Office Committee of the Senate or by the State Republican committee, or any other responsible authority, and I am sure that such an investigation will not disclose any effort by Mr. Overall to compromise his political influence."

In addition, Mr. Overall himself gave out the following statement to the public:

"I have wired to Washington requesting a thorough examination of the charges preferred against me by Senator McKELLAR and have also requested our State chairman, Mr. Gore, to call the State committee together and to make a thorough examination of the State."

Thus it will be seen that four out of the five Republican Congressmen in Tennessee, and Mr. Overall himself, desire an investigation.

FOURTEENTH.

In closing, I wish further to suggest that the contention made by Mr. May and Mr. Overall that this money was to be used as expense money to Washington is contradicted by the statement of Mr. Overall in his letter of July 7:

"Perhaps, as you know, the department has been referring to me the three having the highest grades, and I am allowed to select one from the three for appointment."

If Mr. Overall has an agreement with the Post Office Department, as he alleges, whereby he selects the one of the three eligibles for appointment, a trip to Washington about these offices is wholly unnecessary and no applicants for office should be required to pay such expense in whole or in part, even under the barter and sale system which is here shown to exist. Mr. Overall could sit in his office at Nashville or in his home at Nashville and select for appointment these civil-service applicants just as well as he could do it in Washington, and perhaps better. Of course, the statement that it is for expense money to Washington is a subterfuge, and the statement that it was to make up a deficit of the national committee is untrue, as shown in the sixth paragraph hereof by the admission of Mr. Overall himself, who says that such deficit had already been paid. But to whomsoever the money was to go, it was a corrupt collection of money, admittedly from applicants for office, and it has never been restored nor have the receivers of the money been punished.

In making these charges, I am simply repeating charges already widely published in my State. I make them in the interest of an honest administration of the civil-service and other laws and in the hope of preventing a further corrupt trafficking in public offices in my own State.

Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH MCKELLAR.

ELECTION OF SENATORS.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I enter a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from the further consideration of Senate resolution 289, adding to the Standing Rules of the Senate a rule relative to statements of receipts and expenditures of candidates for nomination or election for United States Senator. I understand that the motion will go over under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be entered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened; and (at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously made, took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, May 13, 1922, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION.

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 12 (legislative day of April 20), 1922.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Thomas J. Kennamer, of Alabama, to be United States marshal, northern district of Alabama, vice Henry A. Skeggs, whose term expires May 18, 1922.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 12 (legislative day of April 20), 1922.

MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL FARM LOAN BOARD.

Robert A. Cooper to be a member of the Federal Farm Loan Board.

COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND FISHERIES.

Henry O'Malley to be Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Peter G. Johnston to be receiver of public moneys at Blackfoot, Idaho.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

William F. Hanell, Patterson.
William E. Edwards, Westmoreland.

FLORIDA.

Thomas Roden, Fort Pierce.
Rhea W. Pherigo, Kissimmee.

IDAHO.

Charles C. Henderson, Kamiah.

ILLINOIS.

Arthur L. Patterson, Grayville.

LOUISIANA.

John A. Moody, Cotton Valley.
Moses Biggs, Grayson.
Maggie E. Jones, Ringgold.

NEW YORK.

G. Frank Van Keuren, Allaben.
Hattie D. Lyon, East Setauket.
Annabel Wood, Hilton.
Anna M. Auch Moedy, Rosendale.
Andrew Wishart, Setauket.

TEXAS.

Hubert L. Ford, Bellevue.
John W. Robbins, Clyde.
William W. Sloan, Falfurrias.
George P. Harden, Groom.
Alice M. Smith, Livingston.
Joe H. Victory, New Willard.
Walter C. Vickers, Omaha.

VIRGINIA.

William D. Austin, Buena Vista.

WASHINGTON.

Frank G. Sanford, Bucoda.
Elva N. Hamilton, Mansfield.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 12, 1922.

POSTMASTER.

Charles A. Allen to be postmaster at Milaca, in the State of Minnesota.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, May 12, 1922.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. WALSH.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Spera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Holy, holy, holy, Lord, God Almighty, we most gratefully acknowledge Thy providence to be as the rock of ages that has withstood the tests and testimonies of time. We bless Thee that the broken "rock" shows us the best way to live, namely, the way of sacrifice and service. Be pleased to direct our President with great wisdom. Be with the entire citizenship of our country, and strengthen it with a growing reverence for law and authority. Bless every life with great peace, and lead us in our deliberations. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

READJUSTMENT OF THE PAY OF THE ARMY, NAVY, ETC.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10972.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE].

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. KRAUS. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 37, noes 6.

Mr. KRAUS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana makes the point that there is no quorum present. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees. Those in favor of the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union will, as their names are called, answer "yea," those opposed will answer "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 265, nays 2, not voting 162, as follows:

YEAS—265.

Ackerman	Fairchild	Larsen, Ga.	Robison
Almon	Fairfield	Larson, Minn.	Rodenberg
Anderson	Faust	Lawrence	Rogers
Andrew, Mass.	Favrot	Layton	Rose
Andrews, Nebr.	Fenn	Lazaro	Rossdale
Appleby	Fess	Leatherwood	Rouse
Aswell	Fisher	Lee, Ga.	Rucker
Barbour	Fordney	Leibach	Sabath
Bell	Foster	Lineberger	Sandlin
Benham	Free	Linthicum	Schall
Bird	Freeman	London	Scott, Mich.
Black	French	Longworth	Scott, Tenn.
Blakeney	Prothingham	Lowrey	Shaw
Bland, Ind.	Fuller	Luce	Shelton
Bland, Va.	Fulmer	Luhring	Sinclair
Bond	Funk	Lyon	Sinnott
Bowers	Gahn	McClintic	Smith, Idaho
Bowling	Gallivan	McCormick	Speaks
Box	Garner	McDuffie	Sprout
Brennan	Garrett, Tenn.	McKenzie	Stafford
Brooks, Ill.	Garrett, Tex.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Stagall
Brown, Tenn.	Gensman	McSwain	Stedman
Browne, Wis.	Gerner	Madden	Steenerson
Buchanan	Glynn	Magee	Stephens
Bulwinkle	Greene, Vt.	Mapes	Stoll
Burroughs	Griffin	Michener	Strong, Kans.
Burtness	Hadley	Miller	Summers, Wash.
Burton	Hammer	Mills	Summers, Tex.
Byrnes, S. C.	Hardy, Colo.	Millsbaugh	Swank
Byrns, Tenn.	Harrison	Mondell	Tague
Cable	Haugen	Montague	Taylor, N. J.
Campbell, Kans.	Hawes	Montoya	Temple
Cannon	Henry	Moore, Ill.	Ten Eyck
Cantrill	Herrick	Moore, Va.	Thomas
Carew	Hersey	Moore, Ind.	Thompson
Carter	Hickey	Mott	Tillman
Chalmers	Hill	Murphy	Timberlake
Chandler, N. Y.	Himes	Nelson, Me.	Tincher
Chandler, Okla.	Hoch	Nelson, A. P.	Tinkham
Chindblom	Hogan	Newton, Minn.	Towner
Christopherson	Hooker	Norton	Tucker
Clague	Hukriede	Ogden	Tyson
Clarke, N. Y.	Hull	Oldfield	Upshaw
Clouse	Husted	Oliver	Valle
Codd	Hutchinson	Olpp	Vestal
Cole, Iowa	Jacoway	Overstreet	Vinson
Cole, Ohio	Jeffers, Nebr.	Padgett	Volstead
Collier	Jeffers, Ala.	Paige	Wason
Colton	Johnson, Ky.	Park, Ga.	Watson
Connally, Tex.	Johnson, Miss.	Parker, N. J.	Weaver
Cooper, Ohio	Johnson, Wash.	Parks, Ark.	Webster
Cooper, Wis.	Jones, Tex.	Patterson, Mo.	Wheeler
Crowther	Keller	Pou	White, Kans.
Cullen	Kennedy	Pringey	White, Me.
Dale	Ketcham	Purnell	Williams
Dallinger	Kincheloe	Quin	Williamson
Deal	King	Radcliffe	Wilson
Denison	Kinkaid	Raker	Wise
Doughton	Kirkpatrick	Ramseyer	Woodruff
Dowell	Kissel	Rankin	Woods, Va.
Drewry	Kline, N. Y.	Rayburn	Wright
Dunbar	Kline, Pa.	Reece	Wyant
Dunn	Knutson	Reed, W. Va.	Yates
Dupré	Kraus	Rhodes	Young
Echols	Lampert	Ricketts	
Elliott	Lanham	Roach	
Evans	Lankford	Robertson	

NAYS—2.

Huddleston Sisson

NOT VOTING—162.

Ansorge	Connolly, Pa.	Gorman	Klecza
Anthony	Copley	Gould	Knight
Arentz	Coughlin	Graham, Ill.	Kopp
Atkeson	Crago	Graham, Pa.	Kreider
Bacharach	Cramton	Green, Iowa	Kunz
Bankhead	Crisp	Greene, Mass.	Langley
Barkley	Curry	Griest	Lea, Calif.
Beck	Darrow	Hardy, Tex.	Lee, N. Y.
Beedy	Davis, Minn.	Hawley	Little
Begg	Davis, Tenn.	Hayden	Logan
Bixler	Dempsey	Hays	McArthur
Blanton	Dickinson	Hicks	McFadden
Boies	Dominick	Hudspeth	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Brand	Drane	Humphreys	McLaughlin, Pa.
Briggs	Driver	Ireland	McPherson
Britten	Dyer	James	MacGregor
Brooks, Pa.	Edmonds	Johnson, S. Dak.	Maloney
Burdick	Ellis	Jones, Pa.	Mann
Butler	Fields	Kahn	Mansfield
Campbell, Pa.	Fish	Kearns	Martin
Clark, Fla.	Fitzgerald	Kelley, Mich.	Mead
Classon	Focht	Kelly, Pa.	Merritt
Cockran	Frear	Kendall	Michaelson
Collins	Gilbert	Kless	Moore, Ohio
Connell	Goldsborough	Kindred	Morgan
	Goodykoontz	Kitchin	Morin

Mudd	Ransley	Smith, Mich.	Underhill
Nelson, J. M.	Reavis	Smithwick	Vare
Newton, Mo.	Reber	Snell	Voigt
Nolan	Reed, N. Y.	Snyder	Volk
O'Brien	Riddick	Stevenson	Walters
O'Connor	Riordan	Stiness	Ward, N. Y.
Osborne	Rosenbloom	Strong, Pa.	Ward, N. C.
Parker, N. Y.	Ryan	Sullivan	Wingo
Patterson, N. J.	Sanders, Ind.	Sweet	Winslow
Perkins	Sanders, N. Y.	Swing	Wood, Ind.
Perlman	Sanders, Tex.	Taylor, Ark.	Woodyard
Petersen	Sears	Taylor, Colo.	Wurzbach
Porter	Shreve	Taylor, Tenn.	Zihlman
Rainey, Ala.	Siegel	Tilson	
Rainey, Ill.	Slemp	Treadway	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Treadway with Mr. Cockran.

Mr. Dickinson with Mr. Briggs.

Mr. Knight with Mr. Smithwick.

Mr. Bixler with Mr. Goldsborough.

Mr. McArthur with Mr. Bankhead.

Mr. Shreve with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Perlman with Mr. Hayden.

Mr. Kleczka with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Connell with Mr. Riordan.

Mr. Smith of Michigan with Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Boies with Mr. Brand.

Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Fields.

Mr. Stiness with Mr. Humphreys.

Mr. Kearns with Mr. Lea of California.

Mr. Davis of Minnesota with Mr. Dominick.

Mr. Beedy with Mr. Barkley.

Mr. Fitzgerald with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Coughlin with Mr. Driver.

Mr. Patterson of New Jersey with Mr. Wingo.

Mr. Kahn with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.

Mr. Griest with Mr. Kindred.

Mr. Perkins with Mr. Logan.

Mr. Kendall with Mr. Drewry.

Mr. Newton of Missouri with Mr. Crisp.

Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.

Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. Hudspeth.

Mr. Atkeson with Mr. O'Connor.

Mr. Winslow with Mr. Sanders of Texas.

Mr. McPherson with Mr. Kitchin.

Mr. Kiess with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.

Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Hardy of Texas.

Mr. Sanders of New York with Mr. Collins.

Mr. Butler with Mr. Rainey of Illinois.

Mr. Reed of New York with Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Wurzbach with Mr. Blanton.

Mr. Darrow with Mr. Mead.

Mr. Gorman with Mr. Sears.

Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Taylor of Arkansas.

Mr. Osborne with Mr. Mansfield.

Mr. Siegel with Mr. Kunz.

Mr. Kopp with Mr. Campbell of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Volk with Mr. Rainey of Alabama.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10972, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of further considering the bill H. R. 10972, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10972) to readjust the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman. I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. STAFFORD: Strike out section 2 and insert in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 2. That any commissioned officer in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act who receive allowances for quarters as provided herein shall not receive any increase of pay for sea duty."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, under existing law persons connected with the Navy and the Coast Guard Service are en-

titled to 10 per cent additional pay while on sea duty. There is no additional pay allowed under existing law, so far as the Army is concerned, for field duty. The section reported by the committee attempts to reduce the pay for sea duty from 10 per cent to 5 per cent. The amendment that I propose is to eliminate entirely any pay for sea duty.

Under existing law commissioned officers connected with the Navy and the Coast Guard Service receive no allowance for quarters. In this bill they receive allowance in addition to the \$1,000 or more of increased pay—allowances ranging from the lowest grade, period 1, of \$480 a year to \$1,500 in some instances. We are giving that increased allowance for quarters to the Navy and to the Coast Guard Service, which they do not have to-day.

We are also giving them additional allowance for rations, amounting to several hundred dollars a year. Now, this provision for field duty in the Army is absolutely unworkable, and if you increase the pay, as you do or are doing in committee, not only the base pay, amounting in many instances to several thousand dollars, but adding to that allowances for quarters ranging from \$480 to \$1,500, why should you increase their pay still more under the guise of sea and field duty? In the Postal Service, when you send men out in the Railway Mail Service you do not give them any additional pay for being away from their homes on field duty. In the inspectors' service you do not provide anything additional to them for doing their duty away from their offices. The place of duty for the Coast Guard and for the Navy is on the sea. Seventy or eighty per cent of the officers connected with the Navy perform their duty at sea.

Now, let us be a little reasonable. If by this act we are increasing the base pay of all these Coast Guard officers and naval officers several hundred dollars, and in some instances several thousand dollars, and adding to that allowances for quarters in varying amounts running from \$480, the lowest, up to \$1,500, which is going pretty far, why should the committee attempt to graft on the military service an extra percentage of pay for field duty when in war commissioned officers get an additional rating? When that emergency comes we can provide for that just as we did in the late war.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Under what condition does the Coast Guard get the additional allowance?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have taken the authority of those who have stated it on the floor that section 1571 is broad enough to cover that.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. I understand, if the gentleman will permit, that the ruling of the comptroller was to the effect that the Coast Guard might come under that, but I have never known of an instance where the Coast Guard came in under it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am glad the gentleman called that to my attention. We are giving the Coast Guard a higher increased pay than any other branch of the service, and yet it is proposed here to add to the pay of naval officers for sea duty a million dollars additional. The expense for quarters alone will run into several million dollars in allowances to naval officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes longer in order to answer questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be glad to answer.

Mr. McKENZIE. Of course, the gentleman heard my statement in connection with this question yesterday?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to ask the gentleman if in his amendment he does not provide that naval officers at sea, not receiving commutation allowance, may have the right to draw 5 per cent sea duty?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes. I understand that there is no person under this bill at sea or at home who will not receive commutation of quarters.

Mr. McKENZIE. One moment. I do not understand that it is the gentleman's purpose to add to this bill expenses which we do not incur. This bill provides that officers at sea without dependents shall not receive commutation of quarters.

Mr. STAFFORD. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Every person, whether he has dependents or not, gets commutation of

quarters, both at sea and at home. I thought the gentleman was acquainted with his own bill. Section 6 provides for an allowance for quarters to every person; and every person, whether he has a dependent or not, receives the minimum allowance of two rooms, at \$20 per month each, or \$40, namely, \$480 a year. Will the gentleman dispute that?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes. If I understand the gentleman correctly, and if he will read to the end of the section, he will see the language "but no rental allowance shall be made to any officer without dependents by reason of his employment on field or sea duty."

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice that provision, yes; and I have that marked for elimination. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I am glad the gentleman has it marked. That provision as I read it is a saving clause only, so that no additional allowance for quarters will be granted him if he has no dependents by reason of his sea duty.

Mr. STAFFORD. We are seeking by the proposed amendment to prevent any increase of pay being granted to any commissioned officer in the service who is receiving an allowance for quarters. Grant what the gentleman says is true. Nevertheless, does the committee contend that in addition to allowing them from \$480 to \$1,500 for quarters we are to add to that 5 per cent for pay?

It is true that I should have preferred the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] yesterday evening, but with the few Members here, it was not given that consideration which should have been given to it. I have drafted it in this form. If it is adopted you may rest assured it will be in the proper form, so that no one shall get sea-duty pay who gets an allowance for quarters.

Mr. EVANS. What does the gentleman propose to do as to field duty?

Mr. STAFFORD. It eliminates field duty altogether. The members of the Army never receive anything for field duty.

Mr. EVANS. Does the gentleman's amendment cure the difficulty?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; it eliminates it entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, there is very considerable doubt as to the advisability of a provision under which the Army is to receive an increase of 5 per cent for what is called field duty. It seems to me rather questionable as a matter of principle and quite impossible as a matter of administration. I think it would be very difficult, indeed, to draw any regulation under the provisions of this section for that class of duty. The bill provides that field duty shall be defined for the purposes of this act as "service in mobilization." Well, such services might be very temporary.

Concentration.

I do not know just what that includes. It might be a service of a few days, whatever concentration is.

Instruction.

Many officers, including retired officers, are engaged in the work of instruction in educational institutions. Are they entitled to field pay, 5 per cent? Undoubtedly they would be under this language.

Service in campaigns.

Of course, if there is to be any field pay, that is the condition under which it would be justified—service in campaign. But it covers also service—

In simulated campaign or on the march.

An organization leaves a post for a two, or three, or four, or five, or six day practice march, or it may from its post engage in a simulated campaign. Just when does the field pay begin and when does it end? It strikes me that unless the committee has it very clearly in mind how this provision shall be administered, and can make that very plain, we should be very slow in adopting a provision of this kind. This is entirely new, and not urged by the Army, as I understand, but for the purpose of equalizing, it is said.

Mr. McKENZIE. Equalizing upward.

Mr. MONDELL. We always equalize upward, never equalize downward. It is said it is for the purpose of equalizing conditions between the Army and the Navy. Now, I do not know enough about naval service to have a very clear idea as to whether the Navy should in time of peace have 5 per cent or any per cent extra for sea duty. I am very glad to listen to any argument gentlemen can make, but as the matter now appeals to me I do believe this provision for 5 per cent additional field pay for the Army is not only very questionable as a matter of

policy, but I believe it is absolutely unworkable as a matter of practice and administration.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I quite agree with what the gentleman has said, and I understand that the Army never solicited this thing, but that it has been put in here in an attempt to equalize between the two services. But let us go back of that. Why would it not be the right idea to strike both out? Why should not a sailor go to sea?

Mr. MONDELL. That is his business.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. A sailor should go to sea, just the same as a soldier should go into the field. That is his business. Why can we not equalize as between the two services by striking both out?

Mr. MILLS. I think the gentleman from Vermont is right.

Mr. MONDELL. I want to make clear my attitude in regard to this bill. We must have legislation on this subject. I desire to support the committee, but I think it is incumbent upon the committee to prove the wisdom of every provision in their bill. I think this is of very doubtful wisdom.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MONDELL. If I have the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment and submit in lieu thereof the following, which will obviate all question as to the condition called to my attention by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. I propose as a modification of my amendment to strike out section 2 and in lieu thereof insert the following:

Sec. 2. That no commissioned officer, while on field or sea duty, shall receive any increase of his base pay by reason of such duty.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield? Is that substitute necessary?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is just what I was going to ask.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; because under existing law naval officers receive 10 per cent additional for sea duty, and there must be some positive enactment of law in order to rescind that legislative provision.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, let the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the proposed modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Strike out section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 2. That no commissioned officer, while on field or sea duty, shall receive any increase of his base pay by reason of such duty."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman modifying his amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to lose the right to make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. That it is substantially what was voted down yesterday evening under the Bulwinkle amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Is there objection to the gentleman modifying his amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. If I make no objection to the modification, does that preclude me from making my point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not.

Mr. PADGETT. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the requested modification?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, I make my point of order that this is substantially the same amendment that was voted down yesterday evening.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] makes the point of order that the amendment as now modified is the same amendment in substance that was voted down yesterday.

Mr. STAFFORD. If there is any modification, as I take it, it is not for the Chair to pass upon the effect of the amendment. It has been ruled frequently that if there is any change in the phraseology of the amendment, that is sufficient to make it in order.

Mr. OLIVER. The amendment that the gentleman has offered would be absolutely meaningless, for the reason that you have no existing law that gives—

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. I move, as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin, to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I make the point of order that that is the same amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. If no gentlemen desires to be heard, the Chair will rule on the point of order.

The objection of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is to the amendment to his amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. In the judgment of the Chair the point of order is not well taken. It is not in substance or in form like the one decided yesterday.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have offered a substitute to strike out the section, and I understand the gentleman from South Carolina has made a point of order.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I did; that it is the same amendment that was considered and voted upon yesterday afternoon.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I was not present when the amendment was debated last evening, and so I am not informed as to the parliamentary situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that there was no motion to simply strike out the section; the motion was to strike out the section and insert, so that point of order is not well taken.

Mr. MONDELL. The point of order is overruled?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up the time of the committee, but it does seem to me very clear that the provisions of this section are questionable, of doubtful wisdom and propriety. I think they should go out.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I wish simply to state that the committee in writing this section was trying to do what we believed the fair thing to both services. We put them on a parity; we cut down sea pay by 50 per cent. If it is the judgment of the House that this section should be eliminated from the bill, that is one thing. It would be logical to strike it out; but it is illogical and inconsistent to undertake to discriminate, as does the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KING. What does the gentleman want?

Mr. McKENZIE. I am for the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming should carry, the existing law will prevail.

Mr. McKENZIE. Certainly; and that is 10 per cent sea pay.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question.

Mr. McKENZIE. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Did the committee give careful consideration to this particular phase of the bill?

Mr. McKENZIE. We certainly did.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is good enough for me.

Mr. MONDELL. The committee has admitted that no one asked for this provision so far as the Army is concerned, and the reading of the paragraph itself makes it very clear that it would be utterly impossible to administer it. There is no question about that.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. As I understand, the committee provides for 5 per cent increase in pay for field service and does away with the 10 per cent additional pay for foreign service and sea service.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If you are going to take away from the Army officer something you have not given him yet—the 5 per cent—why do you insist that the naval officer shall keep it? Where is the fairness in it? Both men are supposed to go into the service for the sake of performing their duty, and when one goes to sea and the other goes into the field one gets something for it and the other does not.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the modified amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. May we have it again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin ought to prevail. It seems to me that no commissioned officer ought to receive this additional pay. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming should prevail, it would leave on the books a provision by which the officers of the Navy would re-

ceive additional pay of 10 per cent for duty at sea. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin prevails, it will wipe from the books that provision allowing a naval officer extra pay. I do not see why any naval officer or land officer should receive extra pay for doing his plain duty—for doing the very things he enlisted to do and that he is commissioned to do. [Applause.] This bill provides for additional pay for field duty, and it names a number of things that shall constitute field duty, every one of which is a duty that these officers should perform even in peace times. In time of peace there should be no extra pay for these ordinary duties. If he is not to do these things, for God's sake what is he to do? Absolutely nothing. We propose by this bill to give him extra pay for doing the plain simple thing that he has enlisted to do. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I have no objection to the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. My only reason for offering the substitute was that personally I am not sufficiently clear as to the wisdom in regard to the sea pay. But that is a matter that can be considered later. Certainly there should be no such thing as field pay.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am willing to receive information, but, as it appears to me, I can see no reason for giving officers extra pay for doing their duty. Why should not naval officers go to sea? What are they commissioned for? To sit around the clubs in Washington; to sit in the barracks and quarters? What is a naval officer expected to do?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition for two minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] to the fact that his amendment as drawn does not accomplish the purpose he has in mind. In other words, no naval officer, under existing law, is now entitled to any increase in base pay by reason of sea service. He is now entitled to 10 per cent on his longevity and base pay for sea service, but this 10 per cent is not a part of his pay, either base or longevity, but is additional compensation, the term "compensation" being an inclusive word embracing all pay and allowances. Pay is one thing in naval law and compensation another, and in the drafting of the gentleman's amendment he has overlooked the fact that he is dealing with a technical subject; and what he should do, if he wishes to accomplish his purpose, is to provide that it shall not operate to increase pay or compensation. Then he will have covered the subject.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to again modify my amendment by striking out the word "base" and, after the word "pay," inserting the words "or compensation."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to again modify his amendment in the manner in which the Clerk will report. Is there objection to the proposed modification? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, may we have it now reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 7, line 4, strike out section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:
"SEC. 2. That no commissioned officer while on field or sea duty shall receive any increase of his pay or compensation by reason of such duty."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I hope that the amendment will not prevail. For many years there has been the sea pay of officers, recognizing that there is an equity, a justice in allowing a little more pay to an officer at sea than on shore. That applies to the marines, to the Navy, to the Coast Guard. It is 10 per cent at the present time. In making the general adjustments the committee in apportioning and adjusting these different changes and rates which they have made in the bill reduced this from 10 per cent to 5 per cent. It is fair and just that it should go as it is now to the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard. If there is objection to its going to the Army, the whole proposition should not be killed and this injustice done to these three

services that are required to leave home, to shift from place to place, from time to time, and have additional expense piled upon them because the committee, in a sense of justice and equity, have attempted to assimilate the Army to the conditions of the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard. I hope the amendment, in all justice and fairness, will be voted down.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Is the gentleman aware that the officers of the Navy are now getting commutation of quarters, which amounts in certain cases to over \$1,000 a year, that they never got before?

Mr. PADGETT. That depends on where they are getting it, and who. There are some who do not get it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as modified offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PADGETT) there were—ayes 73, noes 44.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read.

Mr. WALSH (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, there is a motion pending to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that motion.

Mr. WALSH. I object to its being withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FESS). The amendment agreed to was in the nature of a substitute, and, therefore the motion to strike out has no effect.

Mr. WALSH. The amendment which was agreed to was a perfecting amendment. It struck out the text and inserted some new text, and there was pending at the time that that was voted upon a motion to strike out the entire section.

The CHAIRMAN. A motion to strike out a paragraph being pending and the paragraph then being perfected by an amendment in the nature of a substitute, a motion to strike out necessarily follows. That precedent is to be found in 5792, Hinds' Precedents.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to withdraw the substitute, because I am satisfied with the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That when officers of the National Guard or of the reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act are authorized by law to receive Federal pay, those serving in grades corresponding to those of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant of the Army shall receive the pay of the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, and first periods, respectively. In computing the increase of pay for each period of three years' service, such officers shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they have held commissions as officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, or in the National Guard, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers, or in the Naval Reserve Force or Marine Corps Reserve Force, when confirmed in grade and qualified for all general service, with full time for all periods during which they have performed active duty under reserve commissions, and with one-half time for all other periods during which they have held reserve commissions.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is only fair to say that the earnestness of the gentleman from Mississippi has caused him to overlook a few facts. The fact is that in the present constitution of the Regular Army men have not been retained in their war-time rank; nothing of the kind whatever. It was specifically provided in the war-time legislation that whatever temporary rank was given to officers of the Regular Army because of their increased command during the period of the war, they should upon the arrival of peace revert to their old status and files in the Regular Establishment. And everyone of them did.

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman does not contend that these officers got no promotion in the war?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do not know anything about the indirect causations of the war any more than I can figure out what the mathematics of war may be as to the question of high prices. I say, as a matter of law, the law did not give any permanent advance in commission.

Mr. SISSON. For example, you take the second lieutenants, and there are only 77 in this whole Army.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The answer to that is as simple as A B C. In 1920 we passed in this Congress the Army reorganization act, which increased the commissioned personnel of the United States Regular Army at least double, or very nearly double. And there were 5,000 or 6,000 or 7,000 vacancies to fill, and it was provided in that Army reorganization act that at least 50 per cent of those vacancies should go to the emergency officers of the World War, and that the remaining 50 per cent should be taken by the officers of the regular service already in the Army. There were advancements and promo-

tions, and that leads to the very thing I want to speak of in behalf of this bill.

These advancements and promotions came after the war as a result of the increase of the commissioned personnel of the Army and do not relate to the war at all. It was specifically laid down in all war-time legislation that no matter what the temporary rank or promotion any officer of the Regular Army got during the war, he must at the close revert to his old status in the files, and he did. What promotion he got was because of the Army reorganization act. If you had had this bill in operation when the Army reorganization act went into effect, these men whose increases in salaries you are talking about as being too much, considering their years and length of service, would never have received those raises, because it is one of the fundamentals of this bill that mere promotion and grade in the Army do not increase the pay, but there must go with it longevity of service, so that officers must earn that increase in pay as well as the increase in grade. That is where the contrast is. You would have saved millions of dollars if this very law had been in effect then.

What is the effect of it? Under this law, if a man gets an advanced grade through accelerated promotion before he has had sufficient length of service, he will not thereby get his pay increased, but must wait until his service in years has brought him into a higher-pay grade. On the other hand, in cases of long-continued service without promotion, if the policy of this Congress in years to come should be that we would diminish the Army, for instance, it would mean that good men, getting along 35 or 40 years of age, who had gotten no further than the captaincy, and who might never be promoted through the remainder of their service, would get an increase in pay for longevity which is reasonable and just. Everybody will concede it. There is the explanation of the whole thing. It works both ways.

If we had had this law in operation two years ago we would have saved money, and there would not have been all this talk about the acceleration of promotion and the raid upon the Treasury that came from it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, may I have three minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think, gentlemen, if you will permit me to say it in all frankness—because, after all, I think it is simply a reminder; you intended to do it, and will do it—we ought to look at this matter of pay of the Army as a purely impersonal one, and regard the Army as a purely impersonal permanent institution. We are not simply providing pay here for men whom we personally identify as having recently received accelerated promotions. We are not by this bill simply passing out money to some fellow of whom we say he has got his pay raised too fast and ought not to have any more now. We are providing for the men in the service now and for the generations of unknown men who are to follow them. If it does so happen that a few of these young men have, by reason of accelerated promotion, which was brought about by the increase of the Army by reason of the enactment of the Army reorganization act, got into grades and pay that are beyond their years, you may take it as a certainty that from that very fact they will stay in their grades in what is called "a hump" in the service for many years to come, without rapid promotion hereafter.

The very fact that they started out with rapid promotion means, in accordance with any actuary's tables, that they will remain for a long time in suspense in the grades they are in now. So that this question is not that of paying some men whom we now identify as having been too rapidly promoted, but it is laying down a basis of pay for the Army as an institution, so that when these men pass out one by one the flow of their successors will be compensated on a reasonable and just basis, and it will prevent our having the perhaps unusual and unfair allotment of pay in some instances, judging by years of service, that is now possible under existing law.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes.

Mr. KING. I am very glad to hear this explanation of the gentleman. Then we shall have some officers of the same grade receiving different amounts of pay for doing the same service.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If the gentleman will consult the philosophy of the bill he will find—

Mr. KING. I have consulted the bill, but not the philosophy.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Let me pose, then, for a moment as a philosopher. [Laughter.] The theory is that it is not mere grade that determines pay. In fact, the grade may not determine the pay at all if a man lacks years of service for the change in the pay period. So that when one man may be at the foot of the majors and the other at the top, they are both majors, but they have a different degree of longevity of service, and they get pay accordingly. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has again expired.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLAND of Indiana offers the following amendment as a new section: "That all persons who have entered the Regular Army as commissioned officers shall be entitled to compute 50 per cent of their commissioned service in the National Guard and Organized Militia, whether in State or Federal service, or both, for longevity pay."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order, or make a point of order, whichever the gentleman would like me to do.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I would like the gentleman to reserve the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Very well.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. WALSH having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On March 26, 1922:

H. R. 10559. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes.

On March 31, 1922:

H. R. 9606. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time for payment of charges due on reclamation projects, and for other purposes.

On April 1, 1922:

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution authorizing the purchase of land for cemeteries for American military dead in Europe and the improvement thereof.

On April 6, 1922:

H. R. 9979. An act to amend an act entitled "An act granting a charter to the General Federation of Women's Clubs";

H. J. Res. 282. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of War to incur obligations for construction and maintenance of roads, bridges, and trails in Alaska, said obligations to be paid from the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922; and

H. R. 9633. An act to extend the provisions of section 2305, Revised Statutes, and of the act of September 29, 1919, to those discharged from the military or naval service of the United States and subsequently awarded compensation or treated for wounds received or disability incurred in line of duty.

On April 7, 1922:

H. R. 8815. An act to amend the act of March 1, 1921 (41 Stat. 1202), entitled "An act to authorize certain homestead settlers or entrymen who entered the military or naval service of the United States during the war with Germany to make final proof of their entries"; and

H. J. Res. 257. Joint resolution to appoint a commission for the exchange of sites for a post-office and courthouse building at New York, N. Y., between the Federal Government and the officials of the city of New York;

H. R. 9604. An act for the acquisition of a post-office site at Madison, Wis.; and

H. R. 10297. An act to extend the limitations of time upon the issuance of medals of honor, distinguished service crosses, and distinguished service medals to persons who served in the Army of the United States during the World War.

On April 11, 1922:

H. R. 2558. An act for the relief of Richard P. McCullough;

H. R. 7870. An act for the relief of I. C. Johnson, jr.; and

H. R. 8832. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands of the United States in the Tahoe National Forest, Calif., for lands owned by William Kent.

On April 14, 1922:

H. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution to amend section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the opera-

tion of Government-owned radio stations for the use of the general public, and for other purposes," approved June 5, 1920.

On April 15, 1922:

H. J. Res. 249. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to donate and grant certain buildings in Alaska to the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

On April 20, 1922:

H. R. 10864. An act to authorize an appropriation to enable the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau to provide for the construction of additional hospital facilities and to provide medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies for persons who served in the World War, the Spanish-American War, the Philippine insurrection, and the Boxer rebellion, and are patients of the United States Veterans' Bureau.

On April 21, 1922:

H. R. 10429. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credits to and relieve certain disbursing officers of the War and Navy Departments in the settlement of certain accounts;

H. R. 2556. An act to advance Maj. Benjamin S. Berry to the permanent rank of major;

H. R. 7589. An act for the relief of Maj. Ellis B. Miller; and H. J. Res. 309. Joint resolution appropriating \$1,000,000 for the preservation, protection, and repair of levees under the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission.

On April 25, 1922:

H. J. Res. 274. Joint resolution authorizing the commissioning in the Marine Corps of midshipmen under certain conditions;

H. R. 7234. An act for the relief of Miles Swift;

H. R. 8460. An act to authorize the occupation and use of certain lands in Alaska by Ketchikan Post, No. 3, American Legion, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9710. An act authorizing extensions of time for the payment of purchase money due under certain homestead entries and Government-land purchases within the former Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations, N. Dak. and S. Dak.; and

H. R. 927. An act for the relief of Capt. Fred S. Johnston.

On April 26, 1922:

H. R. 2004. An act for the relief of Frank Ferrin;

H. R. 3057. An act for the relief of George Van Derburgh Brown;

H. R. 3270. An act for the relief of Estella Barnett; and

H. R. 8342. An act to empower the Attorney General of the United States to fix the compensation of clerks of the United States district courts.

On April 28, 1922:

H. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution making the provisions of section 2296 of the United States Revised Statutes applicable to all entries made under the homestead laws and laws supplemental and amendatory thereof;

H. R. 1009. An act for the relief of H. C. Mullins, his wife, and minor children;

H. R. 2393. An act to provide for the establishment on the Mississippi River of a fish-rescue station, to be under the direction of the Bureau of Fisheries of the Department of Commerce;

H. R. 8346. An act for the relief of the heirs of Oscar Chrysler;

H. R. 5762. An act providing for a municipal park for the city of Butte, Mont.;

H. R. 5820. An act to place Albert Hamilton on the retired list of the United States Marine Corps;

H. R. 6686. An act for the relief of George Ciszek and Anna Ciszek; and

H. R. 7415. An act to correct and amend the service and military record of Herbert Langley, United States Marine Corps.

On April 29, 1922:

H. R. 10740. An act authorizing the use of special canceling stamps in certain post offices; and

H. R. 5588. An act to repeal section 5 of an act entitled "An act to establish the Lassen Volcanic National Park in the Sierra Nevada Mountains, in the State of California, and for other purposes," approved August 9, 1916.

On May 1, 1922:

H. R. 9671. An act to amend section 87 of the Judicial Code; and

H. R. 8690. An act to add a certain tract of land on the island of Hawaii to the Hawaii National Park.

On May 2, 1922:

H. R. 7272. An act for the relief of Monroe B. Shealy; and H. J. Res. 319. Joint resolution making available funds for preserving and protecting, in the present flood emergency, the

levees on the Mississippi River, its tributaries and outlets, not under the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission.

On May 3, 1922:

H. R. 2158. An act to provide for the monthly payment of pensions.

On May 6, 1922:

H. R. 10240. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Savannah River near Halleys Ferry and between the counties of Anderson, S. C., and Hart, Ga.; and

H. R. 10407. An act authorizing the counties of Jasper, S. C., and Chatham, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River at or near Savannah, Ga.

On May 8, 1922:

H. R. 10007. An act for the relief of certain persons to whom, or their predecessors, patents were issued to public lands in the State of Minnesota under an erroneous survey made in 1876.

On May 11, 1922:

H. R. 10730. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11547. An act making an appropriation for additional hospital facilities for patients of the United States Veterans' Bureau;

H. R. 10941. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to grant permission to use special canceling stamps or postmarking dies; and

H. J. Res. 268. Joint resolution extending the operation of the immigration act of May 19, 1921.

READJUSTMENT OF THE PAY OF THE ARMY, NAVY, ETC.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am convinced that in determining the service upon which to base the pay of a Regular Army officer several different kinds of experience should count. I understand that you compute the service of the West Point graduate. There are something like 400 men, officers, to-day in the Regular Army that were officers of the National Guard. These men necessarily are hand picked. They had to stand the test. You men who were here in Congress during the war will understand that there was a very decided sentiment over this country to the effect that the National Guard officers were being discriminated against and that the test made for them was of the hardest. Be that as it may, they have stood the test, and they are in the service by virtue of their efficiency.

Do you mean to contend that 20 years of service in drilling a company, in keeping the boys together and interested in the service, in intimately learning to know the soldier and his life, and in caring for him and getting him ready for the great conflict that came upon us suddenly—do you mean to say that that service does not qualify him as an officer of the United States Army? And if it does, and if a man is given pay on account of length of service, why should you not give him credit for his service in the National Guard when you give him credit for his service in the Regular Army? To deny that credit is to do him wrong.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. In a moment. Now, it is true that the officer of the National Guard was not in actual training duty all the time. But while he only drilled twice a week, his mind was constantly with his company and his heart was constantly with it, and it was his guidance that made it possible for the National Guard to be ready when this war came on to furnish the Rainbow Division to the Allies.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I promised to yield first to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Do you compute this service and duty as a state of mind or active duty?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. It was active duty as well as a state of mind, if you wish so to characterize it. It was active duty on the part of the National Guard officer in drilling his company and there were a lot of other duties aside from the mere drilling of his company. That service was given before the war, and it is given now. [Applause.]

You say we ought to give a Regular Army officer more pay on account of his length of service. Do you mean to say that the National Guard is not entitled to a similar kind of consideration when it comes to a matter of pay? You say he was serving the State. Well, if he was serving the State the Government should not complain. That service and experience is now

given to the Government. If that special and unselfish experience goes to the Government we ought to be proud of it and not discriminate against him on account of it.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Is it not a fact, as was stated here yesterday, that the average term affecting all these officers is less than three years—two years and a half—and is it not a fact that many of these National Guard officers served on the border for as much as two years?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I think that is true.

Mr. LINEBERGER. That service was just as active as any Regular Army service, and most of the men affected were picked from among the officers who had had the most experience with troops.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. As it is now, gentlemen, you are going to be charged with having written this bill at the behest of the Regular Army West Point officers, and I will tell you that you ought at least to show some sympathy for the man who voluntarily, without being bound by any shackles, has been serving his country and State. And surely in making a proper and just pay for our Army officers, the man who has not been drawing a salary, who has not been hooked up with the Government, the man who put his heart into the work voluntarily, the man who has given the best that is in him to the service, ought to be taken care of also. When the Government picks him out as a Regular Army officer and retains him, those who make the selection know that they are getting good record of service and a good service. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Indiana be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. When the gentleman praises the National Guard officers, we all join him in that praise.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. You are willing to praise them but you are not willing to help them when the time comes to do so.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I want you to find some standard by which you can judge a National Guard officer. The words "National Guard" do not mean all that they imply. Some of the National Guard is not national, and some of it is not a guard in some States. You know it and I know it, and that is one of the troubles; because where are you going to get an absolute standard by which you shall compute and compare the service of one National Guard officer with that of another?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Those who compute the service of the National Guard officer and give him credit for 50 per cent of it will have no trouble in determining what is service and what is not.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. You have got to do it under a general law.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I have little doubt that in case of doubt, the doubt will be resolved against him.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Would you call service in some inside office job, which under the national defense act is given a commission, comparable with service with troops of the line?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I would no more want to pass on the technical details of what is National Guard service than I would want to pass upon what is certain kinds of service of a Regular Army officer under certain provisions of this bill.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. But the Regular Army officer is in constant employment, night and day. It is his job. The National Guard officer serves a few days at a time. Where will you get your standard? We must enact the standard into law.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. It is not difficult to tell whether a man is or is not an officer in the National Guard or Organized Militia.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Can the gentleman give the House some information along this line? I have been told that only about 2 per cent of the officers who lost their lives or were wounded during the World War were Regular Army men; that the others were National Guard officers and Volunteers.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I do not know the percentage, but I know that the gentleman's thought is correct. The Rainbow Division went out from the National Guard. They saw the elephant. They were put in the line early, and they kept them there until the war was won. [Applause.] And I want to say to you that some of the officers of the Rainbow Division very nearly lost the privilege of bringing their regiments home, because the Regular Army fellow wanted the honor of bringing

them home. I think some of them were deprived of the privilege. [Applause.] We had men stand up here yesterday and say that the National Guard officers had the honor of being the head of the National Guard. I want to say that honor is all they ever did get, and if you leave it to the Regular Army officers, honor is all they ever will get. [Applause.]

Mr. LINEBERGER. Is it not a fact that the cynical, cold-blooded attitude of the Regular Army men and of those gentlemen who are eternally defending them in that attitude had a great deal to do with the difficulties that the National Guard experienced in France?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I have no doubt of it. Gentlemen, I do not mean to say that the regulations of the Army should be measured by the standard of the National Guard or the Organized Militia, but I do feel that when you go to pay these 400 men you certainly can give them credit for a part of their service. I am only asking you to give them 50 per cent credit for their National Guard commissioned service, and I think the House ought to grant it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I rise in opposition.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let the point of order be disposed of first. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to this portion of the bill.

The gentleman from Wisconsin, my colleague Mr. COOPER, says it is a new section. True, but that does not destroy the rule that in the consideration of bills amendments offered must be germane to that part of the bill which is under consideration. I wish to call the Chair's attention to the fact that on yesterday when section 1 was under consideration, that part which provides for longevity pay to which this amendment directly relates, this amendment in substance was offered twice in a different form and rejected by the committee. Twice was it offered and by this committee rejected. It is substantially the same amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Were the amendments in the identical language?

Mr. STAFFORD. Not the identical language, and it would have been in order to offer this after the rejection of the other amendments.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. But the gentleman a short time ago said that if there was any change in the language it would make it in order.

Mr. STAFFORD. My position is still in harmony with the statement I then made. We are not considering to-day section 1; we are making some progress. I say now for the benefit of the gentleman from Texas that on yesterday when section 1 was under consideration, which provides for longevity pay, even after the rejection of similar amendments, if this amendment or a similar amendment had been offered, it would have been in order. But section 1, I call the attention of the Chair to the fact at the bottom of page 5 and the top of page 6, is the only paragraph in this bill that relates to longevity pay. The proposal was offered twice yesterday in connection with that paragraph. The paragraph reads as follows:

For officers hereafter appointed no service shall be counted for purposes of pay except active commissioned service under a Federal appointment and commissioned service in the National Guard when called out by order of the President. For officers now in the service all service which is now counted in computing longevity pay, and service as a contract surgeon serving full time, shall be included in the computation.

That is the only paragraph in this bill that relates to longevity pay. As I say, a similar amendment was offered twice to that paragraph during the consideration of section 1, and it was in order at that time. No point of order was made against it, because it was properly in order and germane to that paragraph of the section. Now, however, it is offered as a new section. I call the attention of the Chair to section 5822, Hinds' Precedents, where it says "an amendment inserting an additional section should be germane to the portion of the bill where it is offered." The Chair in making that ruling used this language:

The Chair decides that we have passed the point in the bill at which it might have been offered. We shall never finish the bill unless some rule of this kind is observed. There is a provision in the bill for the completion of marine hospitals, and after that clause of the bill was passed the Chair ruled that amendments properly applicable to that clause of the bill at the time it was under consideration could not be received or entertained by the committee afterwards.

That is the logic of my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman say as to the next section, 5823, of Hinds' Precedents?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is not applicable to this case. That says "an amendment germane to a bill as a whole but hardly germane to any one section may be offered at an appropriate

place with notice of motion to strike out the following section which it would supersede." That is not a parallel case.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, on yesterday this amendment was offered twice in substance at its proper place where it provides for longevity pay. If the Chair will examine the amendment, he will see that it provides for longevity pay. It would have been in order if it had been offered to section 1.

The CHAIRMAN. Does not the section relate to National Guard pay?

Mr. STAFFORD. It does not deal with longevity pay. Section 1 is the only provision in the bill that relates to longevity pay. This amendment relates exclusively to longevity pay. It seeks to increase the pay of these commissioned officers in the Army who have had prior National Guard service to the extent of 50 per cent of the service they performed while connected with the National Guard or Organized Militia. That amendment, substantially, was offered yesterday at the proper place in the bill. If there was nothing in this bill that related to longevity pay, and it being a general bill, then it would be in order to offer the amendment of this purport as a new section. But there being a provision in the bill as reported relating to longevity pay, it is not in order at this place. If we are going to make any progress at all, it should have been presented at the time when we were considering the paragraph in section 1. It was considered yesterday and rejected, and the fact remains that the House can never make any progress if after the proponents of an amendment have been defeated when the paragraph was under consideration they can offer it subsequently as a new section. We will never make any progress in bills of the Committee of the Whole if that fundamental rule is to be violated, that in consideration of a paragraph of the same general purport, after it has passed the section to which it is germane, it can again be considered.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that section 3 does not relate to permanent officers of the Regular Army. It relates to officers of the National Guard and reserve forces.

Mr. STAFFORD. Section 3 has nothing to do with longevity pay of permanent officers.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I do not seek to attach this provision to any particular portion of the bill, as the Chair has noted. It is an amendment to the bill. If an amendment in the way of a new section is germane to the bill, and is within itself a subject matter that can well be in a separate section, there is no logic in excluding it as a separate section. On the contrary, the logic rests with making it a separate section. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] has stressed the proposition that it should have followed section 1, because there was where the longevity pay was under consideration.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Not now. If I had offered this as a separate section, to follow section 3, the gentleman's argument could only apply in so far as that it would not be germane to the section. I ask the Chair to look at the amendment and look at section 3. If we desired to attach it to section 3 it can very well go on there, because we are discussing the question of the National Guard pay. It could well go on there, I think, as an amendment, but we are not going that far. But we are not contending that it is attached to section 3. We offer it as a separate matter and contend that it is entitled to take a place in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman's amendment apply to the National Guard officers or the Regular Army officers?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. The service of National Guard officers as National Guard officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment refers to all persons who had entered the Regular Army. They are Regular Army men, considered as coming from the National Guard?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, are they National Guard officers or Regular Army officers?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. They are Regular Army officers, but the subject that we are considering is the matter of giving credit for their service as National Guard officers. Congress has the right to amend the bill by inserting a separate section, if that section is a subject matter that can be well made a separate section.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That section deals with the pay of National Guard officers. How can the gentleman introduce

into it a provision in respect to the pay of permanent Regular Army officers?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Because we are discussing the question of credit for service. We are not discussing the question of the National Guard pay.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is advocating a very rigid and inelastic construction of the rule, which is not supported by the decisions of the House. Of course, an amendment must be germane to the section to which it is offered, or germane to the portion of the bill to which it is offered, if the amendment be offered in the form of a new section, but that is not construed so rigidly as the provision that the amendment must be germane to the section to which it is offered. If it is generally germane to the portion of the bill to which it is offered, it is sufficient.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. In a moment. This is an amendment which relates to pay, and this is the portion of the bill which relates to pay. This is an amendment which is not covered in any form by any preceding section of the bill. It is not in the first section. There is nothing relating to longevity pay for National Guard officers in that section. This, as a matter of fact, is really new matter and should properly be brought in as a separate section. Where is it offered? It is offered after section 3 which relates to National Guard officers, which relates to the pay of National Guard officers, which relates to pay based on length of service, and this is a mere modification. The fact that section 1 relates to longevity pay should not make any difference. This is in the portion of the bill relating to pay, and section 3 itself provides that in computing the increase of pay for each period of three years' service the officers shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they have held commissions as officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of the act. I contend that to hold so strictly as to say that this separate section must be offered only after the section particularly referring to longevity pay is too strict and rigid a construction of the rule.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman will remember that the first section relates to pay, longevity or what not, of permanent officers. The third section relates to pay of such as are temporary officers, like National Guard folks. The amendment relates to the pay of permanent officers.

Mr. HUSTED. Oh, yes; it relates to the pay of permanent officers, but they want to include one-half of their services as commissioned officers of the National Guard in computing that pay, and that in itself is enough to let this amendment in as a separate section at this point.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York stated that in section 1 there is no provision for the pay of officers now in the service.

Mr. HUSTED. I did not say anything of the kind. The gentleman is mistaken. I said that there was no provision in section 1 relating to longevity pay for officers of the Regular Army who had been officers of the National Guard, based on their service in the National Guard, and there is nothing there relating to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Section 1 is all pervading, if the Chair will permit, because on page 6 in the paragraph to which I directed the attention of the Chair it provides, and it is the only paragraph in the bill that does so provide, for the pay of officers now in the service. That section provides:

For officers now in the service all service which is now counted in computing longevity pay, and service of a contract surgeon serving full time, shall be included in the computation.

The purpose of this amendment is longevity pay. I call the attention of the Chair to the Manual, section 777:

Under the later practice an amendment should be germane to the particular paragraph or section to which it is offered, and an amendment inserting an additional section should be germane to the portion of the bill to which it is offered.

There is no question whatsoever that this amendment provides for the increase of pay of those Army officers who have had National Guard service. Increase of pay how? By longevity service. The amendment was presented yesterday, and properly so, but was rejected twice. I repeat again, if the committee is going to adopt a rule that after we have passed one section of the bill which covers the subject of pay of those now in the service it will be permissible to offer an amendment which was germane to the paragraph under consideration in a prior portion of the bill, and to again consider it, we will never make headway; we will never make progress.

The main purpose that any Member of the House should have in offering an amendment is that he should have oppor-

tunity to have it considered. They have had that opportunity, they have tested the sense of the House. They have not been asleep at the switch and the House has expressed itself twice on this very amendment or a similar previous amendment. Suppose the House now rejects it, will it be in order hereafter every time a section is read to offer the amendment anew? The Chair will realize we will never make headway after the sense of the House has been tested on an amendment and it is rejected if you may offer it anew on succeeding sections or paragraphs in the bill, when the only paragraph in the bill to which it relates is covered by another section which has been read.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman allege that the pending amendment is not germane to the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. It is germane to section 1, because it deals specifically with longevity pay, with the pay of officers now in the service who have had prior service.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] is germane to the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Germane to section 1; yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, it is germane to some portion of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the purpose of the rule.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Just a minute. If this amendment were adopted, would it in effect or by implication repeal or modify any other provision of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. It would modify directly section 1 of the paragraph to which I have called attention time and time again, and which relates to officers now in the service so far as longevity pay is concerned. It would directly qualify that. It was voted upon yesterday.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. It does not necessarily repeal; it merely widens the scope of the longevity of service of an officer to determine the pay; that is all.

Mr. STAFFORD. We have had the matter up, and the proper time was when we were considering that subject matter.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. It is not in conflict.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to page 19, section 14, that has reference to the National Guard, and I would like to get the opinion of the gentleman if it should be voted down, each section following, whether it could be again offered following section 14.

Mr. STAFFORD. I prefer not to consider that question in connection with this discussion. If the Chair is going to hold this amendment is in order, then the Chair will have to hold that every time it is offered in a modified form it can be so modified and offered, but the time for its consideration was under section 1, and it was offered then and the House rejected it.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. It is not the contention of the gentleman that if it is offered and defeated as a separate section that it could be offered as a separate section—

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the logic of the gentleman's position.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. It is not.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will say the gentleman offered it where it was proper to offer it and it was rejected, and now he wishes to contradict himself and say it can be offered at any time.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fess). The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] makes the point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] on the basis that the amendment which would have been in order after section 1 is not in order here because there is not anything mentioned in section 3 in regard to longevity, and also on the basis that section 3 deals with National Guard pay, while the amendment deals with longevity pay of Regular Army officers. The question is an exceedingly close one. There is no question that the amendment is in order if offered at the right place on the general rule that if the amendment would be germane to the bill it might be introduced at any point, without waiting for the complete reading of the bill and then introducing it at the end.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the Chair will permit, I think, with all deference to the Chair, he did not understand my position. I said it would not be in order following section 1, but only in order as qualifying the paragraph at the bottom of page 5 and top of page 6 that relates to longevity pay.

The CHAIRMAN. If the amendment is germane to the bill it is not necessary to introduce it at any particular point in the bill. That very question is set out in paragraph 5823 of Hinds' Precedents, volume 5:

An amendment germane to a bill as a whole, but hardly germane to any one section, may be offered at an appropriate place—

And so forth.

On the matter of germaneness, therefore, the Chair is clear that the amendment does not need to be introduced at any particular point. On the question of continuous operation of permitting the amendment to be introduced time after time after it has been voted on, if this were a case of that sort, there would be no doubt as to the rule, but this amendment is not the amendment which was introduced yesterday. The Chair has read the amendment introduced yesterday as printed in the Record, and while it has the same principle it is different in its details. The Chair is of the opinion that it would be a strained construction of the rule of germaneness to say that you could not introduce this amendment as a new section at any place except after section 1. The Chair is also not convinced that there is delay in legislation by permitting the amendment to be introduced in a different form from that of the day before. Therefore the Chair will overrule the point of order.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a brief statement in connection with this matter. The argument was made on yesterday, so it is not necessary to have further argument, in my judgment. I simply wish to state that in the consideration and preparation of this bill by the joint committee and later on by the special committee of the House this question did not come up for consideration.

It was not brought to our attention. We simply wrote the bill along the line of taking in all the character of service now given to officers in counting for longevity. After the bill was written our attention was called to this matter by some of the ex-service men in the House, who seemed to be very much interested in it, and who came and conferred with some of us on the committee in regard to it. And I said to them, as I have stated now, that we did not have the matter up for consideration; that it was not considered by the committee; that I had no prejudice in the matter, however, and if they wanted to submit their amendment in the House, that was up to them; but I could not accept any amendment to this bill, being chairman of the committee, and hoping to see the bill go through without any amendment. I want to make this statement in justice to these gentlemen and in justice to the committee, and I hope the House will vote upon it as quickly as possible in order that we may proceed with this bill, which we hope, above all things, to get completed to-day.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. As I understand, the gentleman himself has no prejudice against the amendment. He simply desires to see his bill go through, like all chairmen of committees on the floor of the House, without any amendment?

Mr. McKENZIE. I made a statement of the facts.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yesterday the House took action upon the question of civilians entering the Army above the rank of second lieutenant, whether by way of the National Guard or from the training camps or from any other source, and turned down the proposition. Now, does the gentleman think that it would be dealing fairly and equitably with an emergency officer who did not happen to have National Guard service to his credit not to provide him with the compensation that he would be entitled to because of the work that he is doing?

Mr. McKENZIE. I would say to my good friend that I do not think the cases are parallel. But I want the gentleman to understand that I am not making an argument for or against the proposition.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman says the cases are not parallel. They are to this extent, that under the present bill the Regular is cared for and the emergency officer, whether he is from the National Guard or from other service, is not cared for.

This amendment would take care of the National Guard officer, but would still leave the other emergency officer out on the limb. Is not that it?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, as I understand this amendment, it provides that 50 per cent credit shall be given to National Guard officers for their former commissioned service in the National Guard. We have already voted down an amendment providing 100 per cent credit and also voted down one for 75 per cent credit. Although I voted with my colleagues, my service-men colleagues, yesterday in favor of the 75 per cent amendment, I did so with a mental reservation. But I do believe that former National Guard officers should have some credit for their service in the guard. [Applause.] This amendment that we are about to vote on provides for 50 per cent credit, and I think we should be able to agree on giving at least that amount of recognition to the former National Guard officers now in the Regular Army. I desire to point out, Mr.

Chairman, that 82 per cent of these National Guard officers came from seven large States, like Ohio, Massachusetts, New York, Wisconsin, California, and Pennsylvania, and one or two others. It seems a matter of simple justice that we should give them some credit, and why can we not agree on this amendment providing for 50 per cent? Mind you, the best men in the National Guard went into the Regular Army. They had to be the best officers, or the Regular Army would not have taken them. Most of these officers served on the border in 1917. And are you going to say to them that they can not get any credit for that service when they were actually serving the Federal Government on the border, although under the bill it is not computed as such?

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. No; I can not yield.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. I have not talked at all.

Mr. FISH. This is the first time that I have opened my mouth on this bill. I hope that we can agree on this 50 per cent amendment.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do not believe any principle ought to be compromised, whether it is 50-50, or anything else. I do not believe any proposition of that kind ought to prevail in this House. I want to call attention to one practical thing about this. We know, in the first place, that in no organized profession in the world do people bring in with them as candidates any longevity that they may get by reason of something that they did previous to going into that profession. You would not do it in the case of the bar or any other place where it required certain qualifications to make candidates competent. Where has the National Guard ever been standardized so that we can tell what service to count? A governor may give a commission to a man, he may have a nice honorary position on his staff, and then when he goes into the United States Army immediately he gets years of alleged service credited to him for pay purposes.

I do not deny, nobody can deny, that there was some splendid material in the National Guard that did go into the Regular Army. There is more outside that did not. But you have got to have a law with some justice. If a man goes into the profession of arms at 21 from the outside, nobody gives him credit for any time that he was actually in business. But if he goes in at 30 or 35 as second choice, you want Uncle Sam to pay him for all the time he was outside before he made up his mind the second time.

If you once recognize the proposition that you can give these men constructive service for pay purposes that puts them ahead of other men in the same files with them, the next move will be to put those men ahead of those same fellows in the same files for promotion purposes. And the Army reorganization act is based on the fact that a man must go up the line for promotion only according to his actual longevity as provided by that law. If you add this longevity to it for pay, the logic of it will be one more amendment, and you add longevity to it for promotion, and he jumps over those he used to serve behind.

Mr. LINEBERGER. The gentleman, I think, is perhaps right; but there are a great many Members of the House who think that the Regular Army might be improved somewhat thereby. I know the gentleman is sincere in what he says, and I admire his frankness.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman has caused me to say something that out of good feeling I would not have said. He can not but feel that there is somewhere in the air, not far from Washington, an organized attempt to bring comment to bear on the Regular Army which would not bring credit to one of the institutions of our Government. And it also runs to the intention of injecting something into the Regular Army that would be like a burr under the saddle. It is also plain that it is not the intention to benefit the Regular Army as a whole as an American institution, but 400 men.

Mr. LINEBERGER. The gentleman has spoken in riddles. I am sure I have no idea whatsoever as to what the gentleman refers. And I think we would be glad to have him elucidate in order that we may find out at what he is driving.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I will. If you come into my nursery, I can make it plain.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I would like to have it in the record.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. You introduced this subject on the question of improving the Regular Army. Some gentlemen who preceded you on this question also suggested remarks about the Regular Army that were not particularly complimentary.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Well, I think as American Congressmen we ought to be interested in improving every activity of the Government, the Army included.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. So do I, but I believe in doing it the right way.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, the genial and able and valuable gentleman from Vermont has just finished the same speech that he made yesterday on the same proposition. I am not going to take up the time of the committee to make the same speech on the same subject that I made yesterday. [Laughter.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. And I got just as much applause then as you did now.

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama rose.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate close on this amendment at the expiration of five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the debate on this amendment close at the expiration of five minutes. The question is on agreeing to that amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JEFFERS] is recognized.

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I spoke yesterday on the amendment that I offered to the bill and I wish now to take a few minutes further in connection with this new section that has been offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND].

I want to say that this proposition is not entirely new. It has been presented to Congress before, in different ways. I remember that a bill was introduced some months ago by our colleague, Mr. HILL, of Maryland, which bill provided that Army officers who had previous commissioned service in the National Guard should be allowed to compute that service in figuring longevity pay. His idea, as expressed in his bill, is the idea we have in fighting for this amendment, which I trust will carry.

The point has been raised here that men who are now in the Regular service, who are ex-National Guard officers, came into the Regular service of their own free will and accord and could have left it off had they wanted to. I want to call attention, my friends, to the fact that many of these valuable officers in the service to-day broke all the threads of their civil life, broke down their professions, cut loose from their positions in civil life and entered the service in time of stress; and I want also to again emphasize the point that I made yesterday, that when they entered the Army in time of need they not only entered it themselves, but they brought into it companies and battalions and regiments, and in organizing these companies and battalions and regiments they had, in many cases, consumed their own time and money; and if longevity pay is going to be given to anybody, some credits for longevity pay should be given to these men who gave themselves loyally to the development of the National Guard, and when the zero hour had come and there was fighting to be done those troops were ready to stand in the breach until our Army could be made ready. They not only stood in the breach, but they fought through the war with distinction. Now, their credit has been limited to only 50 per cent, and, God knows, that is little enough consideration. [Applause.]

Gentlemen talk here about their having gone in purely of their own volition, voluntarily forsaking civil occupations. They went to France and when they came back many of them found it impossible to get back their old jobs. They found mossbacks sitting on their jobs. When they went to France they were assured that their jobs would be open to them on their return, but they found themselves not able to get their jobs back again, notwithstanding all the promises that had been made to them. They suffered, therefore, very great loss and were under a distinct economic handicap.

Having broken completely the thread of civil life and finding, in many cases, only broken promises in place of former jobs, they looked over the field and decided to reenter the Army. They knew the Army game and loved it, but they reentered the Army not only because they loved the game but because their former professions had been lost to them and they were not able to get them back. Take the case of physicians, for example. They were promised their practice when they came back, but when they came back those promises were in many cases forgotten. And take young lawyers, just getting a little practice built up. They gave up their start in life, and when they came back they found that their practice was in the hands of others, and people forgot to see that they got that practice back again, as had been so fervently promised.

We have heard it stated that there is a propaganda on foot to have uncomplimentary things said about the Regular Army, and mention has been made of a "burr under the saddle." When the legislative representatives of the Army come to know and realize that there are people here who will check them in their deceitful methods it will be a good thing for the Army and for the country. They are not going to be able to put things

over as they have in the past, either by their own efforts or through cold-blooded spokesmen here.

I do not know anything of the "plain" propaganda that has been referred to by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], but I freely predict here that there will be more "burrs" inserted "under the saddle" all along the line until they come to recognize the fact that there are men here who have gained knowledge by experience in the Army game and who are going to check them right along. For the good of the Army organization of this country those men whose business it is to suggest Army legislation must not try to deceive this Congress and discriminate against any certain class or classes in the Army, but they must be fair and honest with Congress and the people of this country, and they must deal squarely with all those in the Army, and not continually try to take care especially well of certain classes in the Army and discriminate against others. Now, that is plain talk, but it is straight.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama. I can not yield; I have not time. The gentleman was not interrupted by me, and I can not yield to him now.

These ex-National Guard men now in the Regular Army were already economically handicapped, many of them, and now you want to leave them handicapped by this bill.

They deserve better consideration and more nearly a square deal. They are amongst the most valuable and most desirable Army officers we have to-day. They are closer to the civilian population than any other set of officers that we have in the Army. They are not so far removed from the people and have a better conception of the relationship of the Army to the people of the country. They are not in the Army simply on account of having been picked up and educated at West Point. They were educated by their own people or by themselves. They served in the guard for the love of the soldier game and through loyalty to the country and to their communities. In developing these National Guard outfits they produced something—they produced the goods; and they also delivered the goods when the time came. They are well balanced; they are good officers. They are now in the service, and certainly are due this consideration that this new section would give them. I ask your support on this proposition. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. STAFFORD. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 40, noes 30.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That each commissioned officer on the active list, or on active duty below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, shall be entitled at all times, in addition to his pay, to a money allowance for subsistence, the value of one allowance to be determined by the President for each fiscal year in accordance with a certificate furnished by the Secretary of Labor showing the comparative retail cost of food in the United States for the previous calendar year as compared with the calendar year 1922. The value of one allowance is hereby fixed at 60 cents per day for the fiscal year 1923, and this value shall be the maximum and shall be used by the President as the standard in fixing the same or lower values for subsequent years. To each officer of any of the said services receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to one subsistence allowance, to each officer receiving the base pay of the second, third, or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to two subsistence allowances, and to each officer receiving the base pay of the fourth or fifth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to three subsistence allowances: *Provided*, That an officer with no dependents shall receive one subsistence allowance in lieu of the above allowances.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Page 9, line 2, after the word "years," strike out all of lines 2 to 12, inclusive.

Mr. KRAUS. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana suggests the absence of a quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fourteen gentlemen are present—a quorum. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may again be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the effect of the amendment I have offered, if adopted, would be to reduce the number of subsistence allowances to any single officer to one, whereas the section as it reads provides that there may be anywhere from one to three, and the argument is made by those who favor the additional number of subsistence allowances that men with families are entitled to better consideration than men who have no families.

To that I reply that when you employ men in any walk of life you do not employ them because they have families or because they have not families. You employ them for the ability which they possess, and whether a man is married or not, he is expected to perform the duties for which he is employed, and no additional consideration is given to the man in the performance of the duties because he is married. The cost of these allowances under the section as it is presented by the committee would be \$10,054,000 a year. We are entering upon a new field by granting allowances to officers in the Army.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. In just a moment. Up to this time they have not been given rations, and my contention is that they ought not to be given rations.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield just there?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Is it not the view of the gentleman that the whole section ought to go out; that we ought not to start any of this ration business?

Mr. MADDEN. I would be perfectly willing to accept such an amendment.

Mr. BLACK. I will be very glad to offer one.

Mr. MADDEN. But I thought I would go along the lines of least resistance. I am frank to say that in the exercise of my own judgment I would move to strike out the entire section; but I was even willing to do something which I feel I ought not to do, and that the House ought not to do, in order to get something done, for up to the present time we have not been able by any argument to produce any effect on the bill leading in the direction of economy.

It is not denied that the intention of section 5 is to increase the pay of commissioned officers. But they do not come here and ask for increased pay in the bill. They come and ask you to give these men rations, and they fix the ration allowance at 60 cents a day, with the further provision that at some time in the dim, distant future the Secretary of Labor may ascertain the cost of the ration and certify that to the President of the United States, who will then be called upon to certify it to the Army, and thereby fix the cost from time to time through that circumlocution. Now, why should we pay \$10,000,000 and more a year to start on a new activity which it has never been thought necessary to indulge in before? If the pay of the officers in the Army is not sufficient, why not say so in plain language? Why should we use the subterfuge of rations? Why should we call upon the President from year to year to fix the amount that may be allowed for rations?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks an extension of five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, let us see where we are "at." In the first place, we grant to the officers of the Army housing facilities for their families when the officer is in the field. We grant them housing facilities, lighting, heating, and all that. We do more than that. We transport their children from place to place at the expense of the Treasury. That is a new engagement that we have taken on recently. Up to a short time ago there were no housing facilities allowed to the families of officers in the Army when the officer was away on duty. But we have changed that. Until very recently there was no transportation allowance made for the family of an officer, but we have changed that. And now we propose to feed the officer in addition to his pay. Are we ever going to stop? Is there no line to be drawn anywhere? Are we to continue forever to increase the expense of the Government in connection with the Army officer?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This is money, not rations.

Mr. MADDEN. It is money, not rations, but it means the same thing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the same officer who gets money in lieu of rations be permitted to continue to buy rations at the Army rate?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; that goes without saying. The gentleman from Washington would have to buy at the regular market rate, while the Army officer is permitted to buy at Government cost. We might just as well hand him the money as a new addition to his salary.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The wrong impression ought not to be given as to the advantage that the officer or enlisted man gets by buying at the commissary.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not want to give a wrong impression.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. He is charged the ordinary price. He is not buying from one who profiteers and charges an unreasonable price, but he has to pay, and everyone who buys at the commissary has to pay, a reasonable price.

Mr. MADDEN. I am making no complaint about that. I was simply stating a fact. It is a fact, is it not, that the gentleman from Michigan is not permitted to enjoy that privilege? It is also a fact that the Army officer is allowed to enjoy that privilege. Does anybody deny that? Is there any reason in the world why we should give an Army officer rations? I ask anybody here to answer. If it is to be increased pay, why do we not say so?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Does the gentleman ask that as a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am under the impression that this was allowed because the base pay was fixed accordingly, with the idea that this would be allowed. Otherwise the base pay would have been higher.

Mr. MADDEN. The base pay has already been increased by the bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. But the increase takes this into consideration.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes. You add this on the top of that, and then you add something else on top of both, and before you get through nobody knows what the pay will be.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The chairman of the subcommittee or of the commission, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE], says I am right in that; that in fixing the base pay the committee took into consideration the fact that these allowances would be made.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes; they did take that into consideration, undoubtedly; but in taking it into consideration they always equalize upward.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. But the gentleman from Illinois has approved the base pay which the other gentleman from Illinois, his colleague [Mr. McKENZIE], says was based taking into consideration that subsistence would be allowed also.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, but it never has been allowed. We have always had the base pay. There is no reason why we should add this to it. It is not justified. It can not be defended. It ought not to be permitted. I protest against it. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in order now.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Very well, I will offer it later. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think the views of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] are well founded. Of course, everybody who knows anything about this bill knows that this allowance purports to be for rations but is not intended for rations at all. The committee desires this provision in order to increase the base pay. It seems to me that if the committee had really wanted to increase the base pay it should have increased it and not come before the House with the pretense that officers in the Army are to be furnished with rations by the Government, when everybody knows that they are not going to be furnished rations; that it is not intended that rations be supplied. Never in recent years, so far as I know, have commissioned officers been furnished rations. Enlisted men are furnished rations, but commissioned officers have always borne their living expenses out of their pay. If the base pay in this bill is not high enough, the committee should have had the frankness to have made it high enough and not presented a device to raise it and yet not seem to raise it. It is provided under this bill, gentlemen will argue, that this makes a 60-cent ration, which means \$219 a year.

Mr. MADDEN. Six hundred and fifty-seven dollars for certain officers.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Certain officers would be allowed three rations, which would be \$657 additional pay.

But the committee says it has a provision in the bill whereby the Secretary of Labor will certify the cost of the rations, and that every time the cost of a ration goes down 1 per cent the Secretary of Labor will certify to the President, and the President will reduce the allowance. That is a beautiful theory, but everybody knows that it is not practicable. Sup-

pose the cost of living goes down 2 per cent, how much will it amount to? Not enough to pay for the bookkeeping. Everybody knows how the allowance is to be made. It is provided that the President shall make it. Of course, the President does not know anything about it; he is not going to make it. The Secretary of War will make it for the President. The Secretary of War is not going to fool with fixing rations, and so the Chief of Staff will make it for him. The Chief of Staff has no time to fool with fixing rations, so some major or captain down in the department will fix it for the Chief of Staff, and perhaps some second lieutenant will do it for him.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman does not want to be unfair. The bill provides the value of the rations shall be fixed on the certification of the Secretary of Labor to the President of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Here is what the bill provides. The bill provides that the Secretary of Labor shall certify to the President the comparative cost of food in future years as related to that cost for 1922, and upon that the ration is to be determined. That is what is in the gentleman's bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman make the prediction that the cost of the ration will ever be less than 60 cents?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Of course, it will not, practically; it might be a fraction of 1 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The maximum is 60 cents.

Mr. BLACK. And if the tariff bill passes it may be more.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Four and three-quarters per cent.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I do not think it will differ over one-half of 1 per cent.

Mr. ARENTZ. The passage of the tariff bill will depend upon when the Democrats run out of words, will it not? [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. As long as the gentleman's party is in power there will be no tariff on words. Now, I am not antagonistic to the Army officers. I want them to have just compensation. But what I object to in this Army bill here is having to look on almost every page to see what the compensation is going to be. We have the base pay here on one page; turn over four or five pages and you have the longevity pay.

Somewhere else there is allowance for quarters; turn over three or four pages more and you find an allowance for rations which we do not intend to furnish, and which they do not want and would not eat if we did furnish them; and then further along, in another place, there is 5 per cent increase for field service. Somewhere else, if they are ordered away, they get 8 cents a mile allowance for travel and \$7 per day for food. That is what is wrong with this bill, and the committee ought to have the courage to frame a bill so that the country will know what the pay is.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. How many bookkeepers does the gentleman think will be needed to keep these accounts?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman from Tennessee, with his long service on the Committee on Appropriations, has a vivid idea of what it would take to do this bookkeeping.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman think it will require any more clerks to keep these accounts than it has on commutations in the different zones in the whole country?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Commutation is not affected by zones; it is the heat and light; that is a good suggestion, to equalize the heat and light. I do not object to it. Take the quarters under the gentleman's bill. A major general, if he happens to be a single man—what does he do? He gets an allowance for six rooms.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks that his time be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. There are not many major generals, but there are some of them, and a major general who is a single man is allowed nine rooms. Is not that right?

Mr. McKENZIE. Under the present law.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. What under this bill?

Mr. McKENZIE. Six.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. A major general?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes. The gentleman would better read the bill.

Mr. OLIVER. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I thought I was going to somebody who knew what is in his own bill.

Mr. OLIVER. The amount, however, for six rooms is larger than the amount that he is allowed now for nine.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes; I was about to call attention to that. He gets six rooms at \$120 a month—\$20 a room. An officer in the first pay period gets only two rooms.

Mr. OLIVER. In the first period. In order that the gentleman may remember the rooms, a man with dependents gets one more room than the period which he is in. If in the first period, he gets two rooms; if in the second period, three rooms; on up to the sixth period, and then he gets six rooms.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Of course, what I had in mind was to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that these allowances are really not intended to supply rooms, but are devices for increasing the compensation. A major general is allowed six rooms under this bill, and was allowed nine under the other. I submit that no major general who is single has any business with six or nine rooms, but in order to get the increased compensation they create a fictitious allowance for six or nine rooms in order to give him the increase in pay.

Mr. MADDEN. And getting nine rooms he is allowed only \$108 a month, while with six rooms he is allowed \$120 per month.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Of course, under the present law the room allowance is \$12 a room and under this bill it is \$20 a room.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it not a fact that a six-room apartment in Washington that rented for \$50 before the war rents now for \$150 a month?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Oh, I would say to the gentleman that I do not think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Knutson], who is a single man, is entitled to as much allowance for rooms as some gentleman on the Republican side who has a large family. I have no objection to giving reasonably increased compensation, but I do object to making the fictitious allowances merely for the purpose of increasing the compensation. The theory upon which this bill is written in a measure tends to destroy ambition among the Army officers. If an officer once gets a place in the Army, his pay thereafter is fixed not by his rank or his efficiency but by how many years he remains in the Army. A man may be a major and get less pay than a captain, because the captain has been in the Army longer than the major has. Where is the incentive to promotion? Where is the incentive for efficiency if all you require for an Army officer to get increased pay is to be able to stay on the pay roll without being cashiered or court-martialed? I believe this whole system of pay is wrong. I believe the basis of pay that is regulated entirely by the length of service is a false basis and does not represent the proper elements that the Congress should adopt in fixing pay. I believe there ought to be an incentive to promotion.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take very much time to answer my friend from Illinois [Mr. Madden] or my friend from Texas [Mr. Connally]. It is a matter of grave regret to me to know that my old friend from Illinois, a man for whom I have had the highest admiration, a man whom I have always felt had a big heart, a generous disposition, should take the position that he now does, and I have always thought that my good friend from Texas was animated by similar feelings, by the feelings which have animated heretofore my friend from Illinois. I love my friend from Illinois. We have been friends for many years. I know his condition in life. I know the beautiful home that he has near the city of Chicago, Du Page County, where he can enjoy life when he gets permission to leave this place where we all have to toil. I know the comforts and conveniences of life that he enjoys, and I am glad that he has them. I do not envy him those. I have always been glad to see him enjoy them, because most that he has in this world is the result of his own energy and industry. I envy no man the good things of this life, but I regret that with his experience, with his knowledge, he should take this floor and undertake for the lack of knowledge—I will put it that way—to mislead the Members of the House as to the meaning of this bill. He does not even have a conception of the great fundamental principle expressed in section 5. Neither does my good friend from Texas have the least conception of what the members of this committee were driving at. Is there a man here to-day, except my friend from Indiana [Mr. Kraus], who would say that we should put the men of the Army and Navy and the Coast Guard and the Public Health

Service and all of these services back to the pay of 1908 without an increase at all? That is the proposition submitted by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. Why not add the amount that was estimated here at 60 cents per day to the salary which is fixed as the base pay?

Mr. McKENZIE. I tried to explain that the other day in my opening speech. I said that for many years, since I have been a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, I have felt that it is an unjust thing to take from the Treasury of the United States and give to a major general, such as the one spoken of by the gentleman from Texas, \$1,684 a year, this to a man who has not a soul dependent upon him, in order that he may live in luxury down here on Sixteenth Street or in the great clubs of this city. My contention has been all of the time that the base pay of these officers should be alike. This bill puts them on the same level. My contention has further been, when it comes to allowances, that we should not give to the man without dependents the same amount of money and allowances that we give to the man with a wife and little children.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Can the gentleman advance any better reason as to why the Government should pay a military officer 60 cents a day ration allowance than it should pay any civilian employee?

Mr. McKENZIE. I am sure my good friend is not serious when he asks a question like that, when he must realize that the men in the Army and the Navy and in these services are not permitted to go out into the world and make money on the side. They are held to their places, they are moved about from year to year. The prejudice against these men comes from the fact that we see some of them here in the city of Washington.

And I want to say to you, my good friends, these officers you see now in the city of Washington had moved many, many times. They have spent years on the border—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. I ask for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McKENZIE. They have spent years in Alaska; and finally after long years they get a term here in Washington. One gentleman of the Coast Guard—a very good officer—who is now serving a term in the city of Washington, told me that he spent 15 years at sea before he had an opportunity to come to the city of Washington. This bill provides that a single officer, like my good old friend, General Crowder, will get \$960 less under this bill—\$1,684 originally—than that which he has been drawing from the Government. But it goes a little further and says that a young man coming into the first period as a second lieutenant shall get \$219. When he gets a little further in life, and perhaps his responsibility is greater, he gets \$438, and the maximum he can get is \$657. Gentlemen, we are not deceiving you by this bill, and we are not deceived. This is not a fund to buy flour with entirely. This gives an increase in this bill to those officers over the pay of 1908; and you gentlemen to-day, if you now want to turn around and vote against these men who are now in the Army and Navy and Marine Corps and the Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service and say that while everybody else in the world has been getting some consideration we will not give you any—we will put you back to the pay of 1908. Why, my good friend from Illinois, when he talks about that increase of \$10,000,000, he means it is an increase over the pay of 1908. Are you opposed to giving these men some increase over 1908?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman tell the House what the total cost will be for all branches of the service?

Mr. McKENZIE. I can only tell it in this way, that the cost of all branches of the Government will be about \$15,000,000 less the first year under the present cost—

Mr. BULWINKLE. For subsistence?

Mr. McKENZIE. I have not figured that up, but I am willing to say it is \$10,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Then why go through the subterfuge of having an estimate by the Secretary of Labor? Can not we fix it at 45 cents or 50 cents or 60 cents? It is salary. It is not a ration to be eaten or in lieu of a ration, but money to be paid out on salary account under the thin guise of ration allowance.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman does not get the fundamental idea of this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think I have, and also I think this figure will never be less than 60 cents, and that there will be argument before us in a year or two to make it more than that.

Mr. McKENZIE. With the Secretary of Labor making his report and MARTIN MADDEN running the Committee on Appropriations he will see to that. The Secretary of Labor fixes the cost of a ration from year to year, based on cost of living. We fix the cost for this year at 60 cents; it might be 50 cents next year—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But the officers do not get the ration; it is money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CURRY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to say to my friend from Washington that we call this subsistence allowance for a reason; not to give these men bacon and eggs, but to give them money, an increase in pay; I state that very frankly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am in accord with the gentleman in the desire to properly pay our officers, but I want it to be done in the open. I am not afraid of the additional pay, but I do not want to see it carried in this disguise.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the gentleman thinks so, I will take the mask off; I want you to see it. We want to fix that as an increase in pay, and we call it subsistence allowance for the reason that subsistence is easily arrived at in the value. The Department of Labor estimates every year the cost of living. It is a fluctuating automatic increase or decrease in the pay of these officers. It will go down, possibly, hereafter, but it will never go up, and can not go up.

Mr. KLINE of Pennsylvania. Are you also increasing the pay of the privates while increasing the pay of the officers?

Mr. McKENZIE. Some enlisted men—I do not know what the gentleman means when he says the privates. Does he mean men in the seventh grade, the lowest class in the Army and Navy? I will say that we are not reducing them and we are not taking one cent away from them, and the statement made yesterday that we are reducing the enlisted man is not a fact, because we are not reducing any of them. When an enlisted man comes in hereafter he will get \$21 when he enters the service—

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The gentleman said this was an increase over 1908?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman give the estimate of the added per cent of increase?

Mr. McKENZIE. I think it is about 20 per cent; it is not quite as much as the bonus.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield for this question: Whether in this arrangement as to pay of officers and dependents the subsistence is not made in this way to reflect in the cost of living?

Mr. McKENZIE. Absolutely.

Mr. HARRISON. That when the cost of living is increased the pay of the officers automatically increases?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes; but not beyond the limit.

Mr. HARRISON. When it goes down the pay goes down?

Mr. McKENZIE. That is it. That is what it means. I thank the gentleman.

I want to say to you, my dear good friends, that this amendment offered by my friend, with all of his plausibility, with all of his talk for economy, and with all that goes with the power of a man at the head of the Appropriations Committee of the House, is an appeal to you men—to do what? To destroy this bill that we have worked on for months and months, harder than I have ever worked in my life, in order to do justice to these men and secure better treatment for them. I want to appeal to you now—it is not anything personal to me—but I want to appeal to you as Americans to stand up and defeat this amendment, because this amendment is offered for no other purpose than to destroy this bill. And if you do not defeat the amendment, you might just as well strike out the enacting clause. I do not want to see a friend of mine from Illinois do that. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is closed on the amendment.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the position of the gentleman on the amendment?

Mr. OLIVER. I am for striking it out. I am opposed to this provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The difficulty is this, that the chairman of the committee ought to have the right to close debate on this amendment. If the Chair should allow the gentleman to speak at this time, he ought to allow some one else to speak. There has been plenty of debate, as it appears to the Chair, on this amendment.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes on this amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I would like to know whether the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole is in control of the debate and can determine the question as to whether the debate should proceed, or that the committee should determine it? The committee itself, as I understand, has not placed any limitation on the debate, and I insist that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] has the right to move to strike out the last word, and continue to make those motions until the committee itself has acted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will act within his rights, and not otherwise. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would ask that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] be given an equal amount of time.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate be continued for 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be given to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] and 5 to myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I understand that agreeing to that request would not preclude the right to offer additional amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] is recognized.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize again that the difference between the members of the subcommittee is not one as to whether the pay of the officer and enlisted personnel of the services, affected by this bill, should be increased over the 1908 pay schedule but rather one as to whether any needed increases should be provided for by permanent or by temporary legislation instead.

There is a sharp difference between members of the subcommittee as to a number of the provisions of the pending bill, not that those differences arise from a desire to deny adequate compensation to officers but from a desire to grant only proper and reasonable increases in pay and allowances, free from unjust discriminations, and to simplify officer pay, so that it may be fixed at an amount that you and others may know what in truth is the pay of officers in the several grades.

This bill in no way simplifies the matter of officer pay and allowances. You have added to it many new factors that will make it more difficult to determine. What are some of the factors added? You undertake to now give a ration allowance. Certainly, this has not been attempted for the past 50 years, and the very fact that we may have had it long years ago and abandoned it is good reason why it should not be again drafted on the law. You have added another item that is indefinite, involves unfair discrimination, not only as to officers now in the service but those who may hereafter enter, in that you permit the advancement to higher pay periods by reason of other than commissioned service to some officers and deny it to others. This involves an increase of \$500 in the base pay alone of those so advanced.

You have been generous as to longevity pay by increasing the per cent from 40 to 50, and by removing, for the grades of colonels, lieutenant colonels, and majors, the present limitation of \$1,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. I wonder if the gentleman has gone over the figures and realizes that for the coming year the longevity pay in this bill will be two hundred and thirty-five thousand and odd dollars less than it would be otherwise?

Mr. OLIVER. Figures are very misleading unless you are permitted to explain them in connection with the facts on which the calculations are made, but we are now discussing a matter altogether dissociated from mere totalities. I am referring to these matters to show the different items that enter into the compensation of officers under this bill, and thereby to demon-

strate that instead of simplifying the pay and compensation of officers, you have really further complicated the matter.

Now, if there be a desire to provide further pay for officers in the service, no good reason, I submit, can be given for providing a ration allowance. It does not comport with the dignity of an officer's commission to say that a part of his pay represents a 60-cents-a-day ration, or two or three 60-cents-a-day rations. Under such a system prior to 1870 it fell into disfavor because of its abuse. We have had nothing of this for 50 years, and I must confess to some surprise to hear it suggested at this late day. Under the old system some officers had worked their allowances up to 40 rations, together with servant assignments. Who knows to what extent this matter will again be abused if we undertake in this cheap, undignified way to provide pay for the commissioned personnel of our military services. Soon the cry will come, "Why, 60 cents will support no one, nor will two rations of 60 cents."

If you desire to provide further increased pay, vote it in a dignified way. Do not undertake to give it under the guise of a 60-cents-a-day ration.

Large additional officer pay will flow from the drastic changes of existing law, provided for in section 1 of the pending bill. As for me, I would much prefer voting gratuity allowances to officers in need rather than a 60-cents-a-day ration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I think that I am partly responsible for the inclusion in the bill of this section. As has been stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE] in his opening speech, the purpose of this section is to provide an increase of pay over the pay of 1908.

The question was whether we should do what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] says, provide for an increase of base pay, or provide for an increase in this way. He says that it is not dignified, but the question of dignity is not involved. If you had done what he suggested, and what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] suggests and increased the base pay, then you would have increased the pay that the officer receives when he retires, because it is based upon the base pay. But when you make it a part of the allowance you save money, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations ought to be in favor of it.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can not yield in five minutes. In my hand I hold a chart showing the increased pay. Here is the 1908 scale, and the scale provided by this bill. If you vote for this amendment you take away from the first and second lieutenants and the captains every dollar of increase over the 1908 pay, and you leave only an increase of pay to the lieutenant colonel and the colonel, who receive it because of their long years of service and longevity pay.

Now, the reason why I advocated the provision in the bill was this: The question was whether or not, in view of the abnormal conditions, this was an opportune time to change the pay. If you increased the pay, and the cost of living decreased, the pay would remain as fixed at this time. On the other hand, if you provided it as an allowance for rations, and the cost of living decreased, then the appropriation would decrease. If you will read the bill you will see that it provides that this is a maximum allowance, but that it shall be changed hereafter every year on the certificate of the Secretary of Labor to the President of the United States if there is a decrease in the cost of living. They say that does not mean anything. You must assume, if you believe that, that the Secretary of Labor will publish statistics that are not true, in order to please the War Department. The Labor Department pride themselves upon the accuracy of their statistics. If the Department of Labor does publish statistics showing a reduction in the cost of living, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will have them, and if the President does not certify to a reduction he will attend to it. If there is a reduction of 6 cents it will be 10 per cent, and will save \$1,000,000.

My friend from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] and my friend from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] told you that a bachelor major general under this law will get six rooms. I suggest that you read the bill on page 10, lines 22 to 25. There you will see that it is specifically provided that such officer shall get only four rooms, and the major general who has been held up to you in order to prejudice the case will get \$960, instead of the \$1,600 that he gets now according to law.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there? The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I regret I can not yield. I am not mistaken. I ask the gentlemen to read the bill, not to take what I say, and not to take what the gentleman from Alabama says. The bill says such officer shall receive four rooms.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. This is a colonel, and not a major general.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman said major general. I have checked it up with the finance officers of the Army, and he will get four rooms. If you adopt this amendment which has been offered you take out of the bill the only provision that enables us to make a satisfactory distinction between a man with dependents and the man without dependents. We have endeavored to equitably distribute this increase in pay over the 1908 schedule. The young officer, unmarried, receives the smallest allowance. He does not need it. Then we provided that when the officer arrived at that rank and age when he would likely have dependents that he should receive an allowance which would take care of his dependents, and when he grew older and it was assumed that his dependents would be able to take care of themselves the allowance was reduced.

We believed that if an increase was to be made over the scale of 1908 it was better to give a greater proportion of the increase to the man with dependents than to the bachelor with no dependents. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for one minute in order that he may correct what I know he would not intend to do for anything—make a statement that would mislead the House as to what a provision of this bill provides. I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed one minute.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman is going to ask a question, I shall want more than one minute in which to answer. I want time to answer.

Mr. OLIVER. I want only time to ask the gentleman a question and let him do the answering.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. KNUTSON. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to section 5, a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it a perfecting amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; I think it is a perfecting amendment. It is to strike out part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 8, line 24, strike out "60" and insert "45," and after the word "day" insert a period and strike out the rest of the line, all of line 25, all of line 1, page 9, and all of line 2 to the period.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the amendment as offered is simple. The preceding amendment, offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], having failed, I desire to place before the House an opportunity to fix the value of one allowance per officer at 45 cents, rather than 60 cents, and to let that figure stand through the various classes and for the future. I can not see that anything will be gained by a roundabout process, based upon a table to be prepared by the Secretary of Labor, to be handed to the President of the United States. It has been stated by the chairman of this select committee that this is a plan to increase the pay of the officers in the various grades. In the amendment I do not offer to strike out these lines by which the officers receive the price of two rations or three rations. I am simply endeavoring to induce the House of Representatives to decide that all ration allowances, which are additions to pay, be 45 cents instead of 60 cents. It is not the price of the ration at all. It is an effort to increase the pay. We can say now by adopting this amendment that the increase is either 45 cents, or 90 cents, or \$1.36 per day, or by voting this amendment that the increase disguised as rations is 60 cents, \$1.20, or \$1.80 per day in the future.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to discuss this matter. It was all carefully thought out by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division. I ask for a rising vote.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 15, noes 75.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLACK moves to amend by striking out all of section 5.

Mr. McKENZIE. Before my friend proceeds, I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of his five minutes all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be closed.

Mr. OLIVER. I ask that the gentleman extend that to 10 minutes, giving me 5 minutes, so that I can make a statement to the House correcting certain misinformation.

Mr. McKENZIE. I move that at the end of 10 minutes debate be closed on the section and all amendments thereto.

Mr. MADDEN. I raise the question as to whether or not it is in order to move to close debate until after the first five minutes of debate have been had.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not.

Mr. HUSTED. The gentleman asked unanimous consent.

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of order that it is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not in order, so the Chair will not put the motion.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE], in discussing this section which we now have under consideration, referred to it as containing a great fundamental principle. Now, the older I grow in experience the more thoroughly do I find out that there are not so many fundamental principles. We Americans have always been taught to think that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States contain a few, and now, this afternoon, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] comes along and adds another one to the list, to wit, this provision of law to pay these officers a ration of 60 cents a day. The historian should get out his pen and ink and record this great event. It marks an epoch in American history. What is this great fundamental of which the gentleman from Illinois speaks? Let us analyze the bill a little and find out. In the first place, officers are classified in six periods. The pay of those periods ranges from \$1,500 to \$4,000 as a base. Added to that is the longevity pay, which may equal 50 per cent of the base pay. Added to that is the pay for commutation of quarters. We will take a colonel for example, whose base pay is \$4,000. He may be drawing in addition to that by reason of a sufficient length of service \$2,000 as longevity pay, causing him to receive \$6,000. He may have added to that \$120 a month as commutation of quarters. In addition to all these he may have added this great fundamental contained in section 5, which my friend from Illinois discussed so eloquently, to wit, rations at 60 cents a ration, with a maximum of three a day.

Now, gentlemen of the House, in all seriousness, I submit that at a time when the Congress of the United States is devising such emergency measures as a revival of the War Finance Corporation in order to enable the producers of the country to get the cost of production, if possible; at a time when the Congress of the United States is being called upon to give needed rations to the flood sufferers of the great Mississippi Valley; at a time when the taxpayers of the country are suffering under a load such as they have never been called upon to bear in the history of the Republic, it looks to me as though it is a little bit too much to ask them to have put upon their bended backs the burden of paying officers a 60-cent ration who are already getting as high as \$6,000 a year. I am not going to vote for any such provision, and will be certain to vote against the whole bill if it is allowed to remain. [Applause.]

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes, the five minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will make that 10 minutes. I would like to have a little time on this section.

Mr. McKENZIE. Then I will make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be used by the gentleman from Alabama and 5 minutes by the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, that can not be put in the form of a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. That is an explanation by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, there are no two gentlemen in the House for whom I entertain a higher regard and a warmer affection than I do for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. I know that neither of them would knowingly mislead the House about any matter connected with this important bill, and that if either has made a statement of fact that is not borne out by the bill, it is simply an error in failing to carefully read or accurately recall in the heat of argument the provisions of the bill affecting the matters to which our differences relate. My friend from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] was rather positive in his recollection that this bill gave to a major general but four rooms. This bill, I respectfully submit, on that point is too plain to admit of any difference between the gentleman from South Carolina and myself. The section from which the gentleman got his information relates only to officers holding a grade below that of brigadier general. If he will read the section referred to he will find that it relates only to allowances for officers in grades below that of brigadier general. Section 8 determines the pay and allowances of officers above the grade of colonel and of all corresponding grades. I will read such part of section 8 as is pertinent to the matter under discussion.

Sec. 8. That commencing July 1, 1922, the annual base pay of a brigadier general of the Army and of the Marine Corps, rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy, commodore of the Navy, and Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall be \$6,000; and the annual base pay of a major general of the Army and of the Marine Corps, and rear admiral (upper half) of the Navy shall be \$8,000. Every such officer shall be entitled to the same money allowance for subsistence as is authorized in section 5 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the sixth period and to the same money allowance for rental of quarters as is authorized in section 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the sixth period.

The money allowance for subsistence as authorized in section 5 is \$438 a year, and the money allowance for rental of quarters authorized in section 6 of this act is \$1,440 a year; in other words, the allowance is for two rations and six rooms.

No distinction is made between officers in these grades on account of dependents. To my mind there should be no question between lawyers as to the interpretation of this section; but that evidently must account for our differences.

I regret to find my friend from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] and my friend from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] also inaccurate in their calculations as to the increases given by the pending bill to officers, exclusive of all ration allowances. Take the grade of colonel. This bill provides a maximum pay and allowance for colonels, exclusive of the ration allowance, in excess of the amount which, under the limitation of \$7,200, the colonel is allowed to draw. Likewise, there are lieutenant colonels now in the service who under this bill would be entitled to draw the maximum pay of a colonel, to wit, \$7,200; even though you deduct from his allowance the entire ration allowance of \$438. The increase in pay and allowance of a lieutenant colonel over the 1908 bill, if this bill passes, based on the maximum pay for that grade, will be \$2,224. There are lieutenant colonels now in the service who will be entitled to the maximum pay of the grade on the passage of this bill. Likewise, the maximum pay and allowance of a captain in the Army and of corresponding grade in the Navy will be increased \$2,197 over the 1908 act and \$1,447 over the May 18, 1920, bonus bill. There are now more than 130 captains in the Army and of corresponding grades who will be entitled to the large increases just stated.

The House must not forget that many new factors will enter into the pay of officers if this bill passes, and it will be very difficult for one not well versed in Army and Navy pay schedules to know what the pay or compensation of an officer in any grade is at any particular time. It will be necessary to know his length of service, whether he has dependents or not, what service he is engaged in, whether he is occupying public quarters, whether he is performing duty with the air or the submarine service, and so forth, because all of these matters may very properly enter into his pay and compensation. Since I have shown that there are lieutenant colonels and colonels who will receive under this bill, even if you strike out the ration allowance, the maximum pay of a colonel, to wit, \$7,200, I do not think the argument made by the gentleman from Illinois is sound when he says it will ruin the bill to strike it out. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is not in order; the time has been limited.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statements made by the gentleman from Alabama who has just taken his seat, I prefer to yield my time to some one with a better knowledge of the technicalities and details of the bill than I. I would be glad to yield my time to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman is kind enough to include me in that category, I will say that I only desire to be recognized for a few minutes. Mr. Chairman, there is little difference between me and my friend from Alabama and no excuse for getting "het" up about it. It is evident that there was a misunderstanding between us. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] made a statement about the bachelor major general.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will state that I quoted from the gentleman from Illinois. [Laughter.] I asked the gentleman from the floor how many rooms a major general was entitled to, and he said six.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I think the gentleman from Texas is right. The gentleman from Texas believed he was right and proceeded to talk about six rooms that the bachelor major general would get, and I made the statement that he would get but four rooms. I did not specify that I was talking about a man without dependents, because I was replying to the gentleman from Texas, who specifically referred to a bachelor major general. The gentleman from Alabama had in mind a major general with dependents, who gets six rooms. I had reference to the officer referred to by Mr. CONNALLY of Texas, without dependents, who gets four rooms. Section 8, considered in connection with section 6, gives him four rooms. There is no real difference about it at all; he was right as to dependents and I was right as to a major general without dependents.

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman is in error in one thing. Section 8 makes no difference between a general with or without dependents, or whether he is a brigadier general or an admiral.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Section 8 says that these officers shall receive rooms provided for in the sixth section. Then if you will look at section 6, page 10, at the bottom, you will see that it provides that where an officer in the sixth period has no dependents he shall receive only four rooms. Then there is the further fact that even if he has dependents he can not get the full amount of the allowance because there is a maximum provision in the bill which prohibits him from receiving the maximum. All he could receive would be \$1,262 in the case of a major general and \$1,062 in the case of a brigadier general, because of the operation of the maximum provision. In the hope of providing a scientific system of pay we provide that when an officer is young, with less responsibilities, he shall receive less additional pay, but when he has reached the period of life where he has children to support and his responsibilities are greater, he shall receive more; and then when the children are grown up and have been educated there should be a reduction in the allowances. The officers agree that it is fair. No man can complain of that except the bachelors, and I think some of my bachelor friends are willing to admit the justice of this provision. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLACK. May the amendment again be reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 24, strike out the figures "60" and insert the figures "50."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That each commissioned officer on the active list or on active duty below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, if public quarters are not available, shall be entitled at all times, in addition to his pay, to a money allowance for rental of quarters, the amount of such allowance to be determined by the rate for one room fixed by the President for each fiscal year in accordance with a certificate furnished by the Secretary of Labor showing the comparative cost of rents in the United States for the preceding calendar year as compared with the calendar year 1922. Such rate for one room is hereby fixed at \$20 per month for the fiscal year 1923, and this rate shall be the maximum and shall be used by the President as the standard in fixing the same or lower rates for subsequent years. To each officer receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to that for two

rooms, to each officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to that for three rooms, to each officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to that for four rooms, to each officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to that for five rooms, and to each officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to that for six rooms. The rental allowance shall accrue while the officer is on field or sea duty, temporary duty away from his permanent station, in hospital, on leave of absence, or on sick leave, regardless of any shelter that may be furnished him for his personal use, if his dependent or dependents are not occupying public quarters during such period. In lieu of the above allowances an officer with no dependents receiving the base pay of the first or second period shall receive the allowance for two rooms, that such an officer receiving the base pay of the third or fourth period shall receive the allowance for three rooms, and that such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period shall receive the allowance for four rooms, but no rental allowance shall be made to any officer without dependents by reason of his employment on field or sea duty.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to inquire of the chairman of the committee having the bill in charge what the present allowance is for rooms for officers?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Does the gentleman want any specific grade?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; but what the comparative increases are, as provided in the bill.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Let us take a major general in Washington. Under existing law he draws \$1,684.85 for quarters, heat, and light. Under this bill, and figuring now for a single officer, he would draw \$960.

Mr. STAFFORD. Suppose he is married.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Then he would draw \$1,440.

Mr. OLIVER. He gets exactly the same if he is married or not married. You would have to change the law.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Oh, I challenge the statement of the gentleman from Alabama on that proposition. I want the House to understand that either the gentleman from Alabama is mistaken or I am mistaken; and if I am mistaken I pledge myself to the membership of this House to go before the Senate or anyone else and ask to have it changed.

Mr. OLIVER. Let me say this to the gentleman—

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, my time is running; and permit me for a moment to control my own time. Will the gentleman give the rates as to the other grades so that the House may know what is done by this bill in this schedule of pay?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Let us take a captain.

Mr. STAFFORD. Married.

Mr. MCKENZIE. A captain now present in Washington draws \$800.50. He would go into the third pay period, and he would be entitled under this bill, if he had dependents, to \$960.

Mr. STAFFORD. What would be the subsistence? Would it be additional to what it is here?

Mr. MCKENZIE. The subsistence is a different proposition.

Mr. STAFFORD. He gets no subsistence at the present time.

Mr. MCKENZIE. A captain would get an increase for rental.

Mr. STAFFORD. How about a first lieutenant, married?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Under existing law a first lieutenant draws \$623.80. Under the bill he would draw, if he had dependents, \$720, and \$480 without dependents.

Mr. STAFFORD. And it is the gentleman's contention that the allowance provided in this bill, so far as quarters are concerned, is about the same within a radius of \$100 to \$200.

Mr. MCKENZIE. It would not average over \$100. Remember, this is based upon the maximum amount, \$20, and that may be reduced from year to year. The existing law provides about \$17.

Mr. KRAUS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. KRAUS. I take it that the gentleman will concede that there is an average increase of at least \$3 per month per room?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Yes; but next year, if rentals go down in the city of Washington and the Ball Rent Act is not repealed, it may be made \$20, because this is figured on the basis of war prices.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of saying that while I favor good pay for the Navy and Army and officers of the Coast Guard, officers of the Public Health Service, and others, I am afraid that hereafter, if this bill in its present form becomes a law, whenever I meet a colonel of the Army, or an admiral, or a chief surgeon, I shall say to myself that the actual salary of that officer was fixed, not by Congress, but by the Secretary of Labor on some statistician's schedule based on the price of onions and potatoes to the people. Congress, in fixing the actual pay of Army officers, Navy officers, and others,

is passing the buck to the Secretary of Labor. The Secretary of Labor will have the say. And the officers will be around promptly to show him—they will; you know it. The price of onions will mean more to the officer than it will to the man in the street. And then, again, when I meet these officers I shall think of their rent allowances, and I shall never be able to rid myself—no matter how great their achievements—of the thought that part of their pay was fixed on the operation of the Ball Rent Act in the District of Columbia. Is that the way Congress proposes to fix the pay of the officers in these various important services of the great Government of the United States?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That when the total of base pay, pay for length of service, and allowances for subsistence and rental of quarters, authorized in this act for any officer below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, shall exceed \$7,200 a year, the amount of the allowances to which such officer is entitled shall be reduced by the amount of the excess above \$7,200: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to the Captain Commandant of the Coast Guard nor to the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Illinois what the maximum pay is that may be received by the Captain Commandant of the Coast Guard and the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MCKENZIE. The pay of the Captain Commandant of the Coast Guard and the man at the head of the Coast and Geodetic Survey is that of a colonel in the Army or a captain in the Navy. When this matter came up for discussion in committee it appeared that these two men, occupying these exalted positions in comparison to those occupied by the other men in the service, ought to have some distinctive promotion. In other words, that they should have the grade of brigadier general, for example. However, the committee felt that we had no right to enter upon that field of legislation, and we so stated to them; but we put in this provision that, while we hold down all of the other colonels in the Army and captains in the Navy to \$7,200 we do permit these two gentlemen, in case their allowance and salaries should overrun \$7,200 to some small extent, to retain that, feeling it was better to do that than to undertake to give them an increase in grade.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That commencing July 1, 1922, the monthly base pay of warrant officers and enlisted men of the Army and Marine Corps shall be as follows: Warrant officers of the Army and Marine Corps, \$148; warrant officers, Army Mine Planter Service, master, \$185; first mate, \$141; second mate, \$109; engineer, \$175; assistant engineer, \$120; enlisted men of the first grade, \$126; enlisted men of the second grade, \$84; enlisted men of the third grade, \$72; enlisted men of the fourth grade, \$54; enlisted men of the fifth grade, \$42; enlisted men of the sixth grade, \$30; enlisted men of the seventh grade, \$21; and the pay for specialists' ratings shall be as follows: First class, \$30; second class, \$25; third class, \$20; fourth class, \$15; fifth class, \$6; sixth class, \$3. Existing laws authorizing continuous-service pay for each five years of service are hereby repealed, effective June 30, 1922. Commencing July 1, 1922, warrant officers of the Army and Marine Corps, including warrant officers of the Army Mine Planter Service and enlisted men of the Army and Marine Corps, shall receive, as a permanent addition to their pay, an increase of 5 per cent of their base pay for each four years of service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, not to exceed 25 per cent. On and after July 1, 1922, an enlistment allowance equal to \$50, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the first three grades who reenlists within a period of three months from the date of his discharge, and an enlistment allowance of \$25, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the other grades who reenlists within a period of three months from the date of his discharge. Nothing contained herein shall operate to reduce the pay now being received by any transferred member of the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve. On and after July 1, 1922, retired enlisted men of the Army and Marine Corps shall have their retired pay computed as now authorized by law on the basis of pay provided in this act.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to get some information as to the amount the pay of a retired enlisted man of the Army or Marine Corps would be increased by reason of the last sentence on page 14, authorizing those who are now retired to receive the same retired pay as though under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I will say to the gentleman that when this bill goes into operation the retired pay will be based upon the grade and length of service. So far as the enlisted men in the Navy and the Marine Corps are concerned, they have special laws covering the retirement in those services. For instance, in the Fleet Naval Reserve men can retire and be subject to call after 16 and 20 years' service, and the same thing in the Marine Corps, with pay at one-third and one-half,

Mr. STAFFORD. We have entered into a contract with these men who have heretofore done service in the Army and Marine Corps. Now you provide to increase their retirement pay. What is the reason for granting them an additional gratuity to that which they are now receiving?

Mr. MCKENZIE. I want to say to the gentleman we did not in this bill provide for anything more than a readjustment of the retired pay to correspond with the readjustment of the active pay. We did not change the law.

Mr. STAFFORD. If you do not make an increase in the pay, what is the purpose of the paragraph to which I am directing attention; that—

On and after July 1, 1922, retired enlisted men of the Army and Marine Corps shall have their retired pay computed as now authorized by law on the basis of pay provided in this act.

That certainly means an increase of the retirement pay.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I presume that is true in some cases.

Mr. STAFFORD. How much would it amount to in the case of these men?

Mr. MCKENZIE. I am frank to say I do not have those figures, but it would be very small.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman think we ought to grant this additional grade to men who have separated themselves from the service?

Mr. MCKENZIE. I do not think that it will grant them any additional grade.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the gentleman thinks it will require increased pay.

Mr. MCKENZIE. If they have the service. It only applies the same principle to these men as to commissioned officers.

Mr. KRAUS. I would ask the chairman if he does not believe as a matter of fact this provision should not be made to conform to the first amendment which was adopted introducing a limitation in the case of officers. As a matter of fact there is a difference in some extent. I do not know to what extent, and it seems to me that the provision for enlisted men should be made to conform to the amendment adopted by the House.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. It occurs to me, from this sentence the gentleman from Wisconsin just read with reference to enlisted men, that if it was adopted it places them on a different basis from the commissioned officer if you limit the retired commissioned officer to be retired with what he is getting under existing law. Now, this retired pay is based upon the proposed law.

Mr. MCKENZIE. The gentleman from Minnesota will understand that among the enlisted men their scale of retired pay is different from that of the commissioned personnel.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the committee having already taken the stand that as far as the commissioned officers are concerned their retired pay shall be no higher than they are now receiving, why should we not apply the same standard to the enlisted men?

Mr. MCKENZIE. I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin I did not agree with the amendment adopted by the committee in respect to commissioned officers. I think it was a mistake.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the pro forma amendment and offer a substantive amendment, as follows: Line 4, page 14, strike out all the remaining portion of the section after the word "law."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 4, after the word "law," strike out the remainder of the section.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, just a word. I believe the committee has already heard the colloquial discussion with the gentleman from Illinois. On yesterday we passed an amendment limiting the retired pay of officers on the retired list to that which they are now receiving, not granting to them additional pay that would be allowed under this bill. This amendment seeks to require these retired enlisted men to continue to receive the present pay and not to give the additional pay which they would have under the conditions of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. That on and after July 1, 1922, the monthly base pay of warrant officers of the Navy and Coast Guard shall be as follows: During the first 6 years of service—at sea, \$153; on shore, \$135; during the second 6 years of service—at sea, \$168; on shore, \$147;

after 12 years' service—at sea, \$189; on shore, \$168. On and after July 1, 1922, for purposes of pay, enlisted men of the Navy and Coast Guard shall be distributed in seven grades, with monthly base rates of pay as follows: First grade, \$126; second grade, \$84; third grade, \$72; fourth grade, \$60; fifth grade, \$54; sixth grade, \$36; seventh grade, \$21. Chief petty officers under acting appointment shall be included in the first grade at a monthly base pay of \$99. Mates shall receive the pay of enlisted men of the first grade of the Navy. Nothing contained herein shall operate to reduce the pay now being received by any transferred member of the Fleet Naval Reserve. In lieu of all permanent additions to pay now authorized for enlisted men of the Navy and Coast Guard, they shall hereafter receive, as a permanent addition to their pay, an increase of 10 per cent on the base pay of their rating upon completion of the first four years of enlisted service, and an additional increase of 5 per cent for each four years' service thereafter, the total not to exceed 25 per cent. All transient additions to pay of enlisted men of the Navy and Coast Guard are hereby repealed, except as provided for in section 21 of this act.

The rates of pay of the insular force of the Navy shall be one-half the rates of pay prescribed for enlisted men of the Navy in corresponding ratings. Existing laws authorizing a reenlistment gratuity to enlisted men of the Navy and Coast Guard are hereby repealed, and hereafter an enlistment allowance equal to \$50 multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, but not to exceed \$200, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the first three grades who reenlists within a period of three months from the date of his discharge; and an enlistment allowance of \$25 multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, but not to exceed \$100, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the other grades who reenlists within a period of three months from the date of his discharge. On and after July 1, 1922, retired enlisted men of the Navy and Coast Guard shall have their retired pay computed as now authorized by law on the basis of pay provided by this act.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to inquire, the information not having been heretofore given in the discussion of this bill, how the rate of pay of warrant officers of the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps, as provided in this section of the bill and prior sections, compares with the existing pay?

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin in regard to that matter that two years ago, in 1920, there was a most exhaustive study made in reference to pay of enlisted men of the Navy, and at that time an effort was made to increase the pay of the enlisted men of the Navy, but before we got through with it we had this hodge-podge bill known as the bonus or temporary pay bill, and the only thing in it that we ever had under consideration at all was the pay of the enlisted men of the Navy.

It was worked out at that time scientifically, as the gentleman from Alabama will admit, and we accepted that pay as fixed at that time with only two changes which we thought to be just and fair to the enlisted men of the Navy.

Mr. OLIVER. If the gentleman will pardon me, I fully confirm what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] has said, and I wish to say this, that no one perhaps deserves as much credit for it as Captain Williams of the Navy. He was before the committee, and the hearings he submitted to it are very elaborate, and give an accurate, detailed description of the Navy and the pay of the Navy.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 11. That warrant officers of the Army, including those of the Army Mine Planter Service, of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall be entitled at all times to the same money allowance for subsistence as is authorized in section 5 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the first period, and to the same money allowance for rental of quarters as is authorized in section 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the first period. To each enlisted man not furnished quarters or rations in kind there shall be granted, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, an allowance for quarters and subsistence, the value of which shall depend on the conditions under which the duty of the man is being performed, and shall not exceed \$4 per day. These regulations shall be uniform for all the services mentioned in the title of this act. Subsistence for pilots shall be paid in accordance with existing regulations, and rations for enlisted men may be commuted as now authorized by law.

Mr. HICKS. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the committee will soon vote on this bill, and I have no doubt but that the committee will approve of it and the House will pass it. It seems to me this bill should be passed, because it gives to us now three things that are absolutely essential and three things that we have lacked. One has been the lack of uniformity of pay, another has been knowledge as to what the pay is in various branches of the service, and the other has been the fact that we have not based pay largely on length of service but more on rank. This bill provides for those three things being accomplished, and I sincerely hope that in the interest of both officers and men of these services this bill will receive the sanction of the House and the Senate and of the President. I most earnestly recommend, after some careful study of the provisions of this bill, and espe-

cially the needed provisions, that the committee see its way to stamp its approval upon it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 12. That hereafter officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, when traveling under competent orders without troops, shall receive a mileage allowance at the rate of 8 cents per mile, distance to be computed by the shortest usually traveled route, and existing laws providing for the issue of transportation requests to officers of the Army traveling under competent orders, and for deduction to be made from mileage accounts when transportation is furnished by the United States, are hereby made applicable to all the services mentioned in the title of this act, but in cases when orders are given for travel to be performed repeatedly between two or more places in the same vicinity, as determined by the head of the executive department concerned, he may, in his discretion, direct that actual and necessary expenses only be allowed. Actual expenses only shall be paid for travel under orders outside the limits of the United States in North America. Unless otherwise expressly provided by law, no officer of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be allowed or paid any sum in excess of expenses actually incurred for subsistence while traveling on duty away from his designated post of duty, nor any sum for such expenses actually incurred in excess of \$7 per day. The heads of the executive departments concerned are authorized to prescribe per diem rates of allowance, not exceeding \$6, in lieu of subsistence to officers traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty.

In lieu of the transportation in kind authorized by section 12 of an act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service," approved May 18, 1920, to be furnished by the United States for dependents, the President may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs when such travel shall have been completed. Dependent children shall be such as are defined in section 4 of this act.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CONNALLY of Texas: Amend by striking out the word "may," in line 10, and the words "in his discretion," in line 11, and insert in lieu thereof the word "shall."

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] will accept this amendment. It simply provides that where the duty of an officer calls him habitually from one place to another, he shall only receive actual expenses instead of 8 cents a mile. It would be ridiculous for an officer who had to go from Washington to Baltimore once a week, say, in the performance of his duty, to be allowed 8 cents a mile instead of his actual traveling expenses. Under this bill as it is drawn, unless the head of the department in his discretion should enter an order limiting the mileage to actual expenses, an officer who traveled from Camp Humphreys to Washington and back each day in the performance of his duty would, in addition to his regular pay, draw 8 cents a mile coming and going.

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say to my friend that that was not the intention. I am certain the comptroller would not permit any such thing to get by him.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. If the gentleman will accept this amendment, the comptroller will not have to act on it. The comptroller is going to be governed by the law, and the present bill provides that the head of the executive department concerned may in his discretion allow it.

Mr. McKENZIE. I have not the time to look up the reasons given for the language, but I do know every word of this bill was very carefully considered.

Mr. OLIVER. All of that is worked out by regulations, as I understand, and we understood that they have been very carefully guarded, but I see no objection to accepting the amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman from Illinois will permit, it will only make certain what the gentleman wants.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 25, noes 42.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 13. That, commencing July 1, 1922, the annual pay of female nurses of the Army and Navy shall be as follows: During the first three years of service, \$840; from the beginning of the fourth year of service until the completion of the sixth year of service, \$1,080; from the beginning of the seventh year of service until the completion of the ninth year of service, \$1,380; from the beginning of the tenth year of service, \$1,560. Superintendents of the Nurse Corps shall receive a money allowance at the rate of \$2,500 a year, assistant superintendents, directors, and assistant directors at the rate of \$1,500 a year, and chief

nurses at the rate of \$600 a year, in addition to their pay as nurses. Nurses shall be entitled to the same allowance for subsistence as is authorized in section 5 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the first period, and to the same allowance for rental of quarters as is authorized in section 6 of this act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

Miss ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The lady from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Miss ROBERTSON: Page 18, line 23, strike out the word "first" and insert in lieu thereof the word "second," and on page 19, line 2, strike out the word "first" and in lieu thereof insert the word "second."

Miss ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, since I came into this House I have never made any appeal as a woman for any special recognition or any legislation for women. I feel it my privilege, my duty, to ask a little recognition for the women of the nursing service, who stand in a class wholly to themselves.

Just a few little figures. The first women came into the Army as the Corps of Nurses in 1901—just of age this year, you see. At first there were only 200 of these pioneers until the border trouble in 1916, and then their number doubled with increased need until there were 400 of them. At the beginning of the war these were in the service. When the armistice came there were 21,408. In all this number of 21,408 devoted women there was not one drafted person. We have heard much to-day of the West Pointer, educated and equipped by his Government, in comparison with the National Army man, who paid his own way—a discussion in which, of course, I took no part. Every woman of these volunteers came to the work trained and equipped at her own cost, after years of the toil and discipline and drudgery which are required to becoming a registered nurse. Every one of those 21,408 had gone through all this drudgery, the scrubbing of floors, the cleaning of sores, the menial, repulsive duties which young women are made to undergo in order to deter them from entering a service which only the bravest, strongest women should go into.

Mr. HICKS. For information, has the lady estimated what the cost will be if this amendment goes into operation?

Miss ROBERTSON. No. I leave that to you men.

To go back to it, all these women had been trained. No one was taken into the service unless she was fully qualified, and some of you men who served overseas or who when wounded or sick over there or here were ministered to by them, know what their work was. In the American Expeditionary Forces there were 10,066 nurses, and God's angels seemed to watch over them, because only three were wounded and only 103 died. The total number who died in the service was 266. There were 257 nurses decorated for their splendid service. To day there remain in the corps 862 nurses, 803 of them being in the number that rank as second lieutenants, 54 as first lieutenants, 4 captains, and 1 major.

I can not give this to you in the hard dollars and cents in which you vote appropriations. I can only think of women, women who must pass through such a fiery test of truth and purity and bravery when they do this work for the men in uniform. I know that in civil life the average life of a woman as a nurse is 10 years, so brief a record after all the stress of years of preparation; but with women nurses in civil life there are so many of them to whom marriage comes when some fortunate man they have brought to health adds to it happiness for nurse as well as patient; but there is very little of this for the Army nurse. She must go into her work governed by the divine-mother impulse that makes the faithful, successful nurse of the woman. One of the most beautiful and appreciative girls that it was my privilege to help educate was a young girl with a slight tincture of Cherokee blood—gifted, talented, educated. I have seen her take a little child, and by sheer force of will of her personal vitality and, it seemed to me, of divine help, bring that little child from the very borderland of death into strong, happy young infancy. Marvelous she was as a nurse; proud of her I was.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the lady from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the lady from Oklahoma may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the time of the lady from Oklahoma be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Miss ROBERTSON. When the thousands of the National Guard went through Oklahoma to the border, seeing them, she heard the call to a new service, and she threw aside all else

to enlist as an Army nurse. And this is the War Department record:

Miss Olive F. Heath was appointed in the Army Nurse Corps from her home at Muskogee, Okla., July 15, 1916, and was first stationed at the Army and Navy Hospital, Hot Springs, Ark. She was transferred to Walter Reed General Hospital June 3, 1917; served continually until her illness January 28, 1918, which resulted in her death from pneumonia on February 25, 1918. Miss Heath was a very fine woman and an excellent nurse. She contracted pneumonia while awaiting transfer to France.

My last letter from her was from Walter Reed telling me she expected sailing orders at any time. She did not get over to France. But the memory of that beautiful heroic life, ended with pneumonia in the line of duty at Walter Reed, makes me come and ask for a greater recognition to these women, for better pay, for more consideration, so that they may have pay and service consideration that will allow them to look forward to a home of their own when they can no longer work. [Applause.]

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the lady from Oklahoma be again reported. I think there are many Members who did not quite understand the import of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will again be reported.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am sure we all join in the beautiful sentiments expressed by the lady from Oklahoma in connection with the services of the Army and Navy Nurse Corps, but the committee, after hearing the testimony and having the nurses before us, decided to write the provisions of the bill as you now find them.

I want to call your attention to the present law which provides the pay of nurses. It is fixed by the act of July 9, 1918. It is \$720 for the first period of 3 years, with an increase of \$60 a year for each period of 3 years thereafter until 12 years, when the limit of \$960 is reached. These nurses are entitled to \$360 a year in addition to their pay as nurses by the act of February 28, 1919. The pay of the superintendent and director of the Army Nurse Corps is \$2,400; that of assistant superintendents and directors \$1,800, and that of assistant directors, \$1,500. The bill repeals this schedule and establishes the new rates found in the bill, which as you will observe are very material increases. The amendment offered by the lady from Oklahoma simply would provide that nurses would receive \$219 additional subsistence money, and if they had dependents then they get one additional room, which would mean \$240.

Now, I have maintained all the time that the committee tried to write a fair and simple and economical bill, giving to everyone a fair pay. This has been indorsed by the heads of the Nurse Corps, whose letter I have in my office, but do not happen to have here. There has been no criticism of the action of the committee, but if the membership of the House feel that we have not gone far enough in our generosity to these most excellent ladies, it is up to the House to change this. The committee felt that we have been generous in what we have done.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the lady from Oklahoma [Miss ROBERTSON].

The chairman [Mr. McKENZIE] has spoken of the compensation for nurses. This bill provides that for the first three years the compensation shall be \$340; the next three years, \$1,080; the next three years, \$1,380; and after that, \$1,560, and the gentleman from Illinois speaks of these as liberal rates of compensation. If he will compare them with rates of compensation paid to the trained nurses in private life he will find the rates of compensation in this bill are very low indeed. A trained nurse in private practice gets anywhere from \$5 to \$10 a day and her subsistence and quarters; that is, room and board and all living expenses are provided without expense to herself. Ten dollars a day is \$3,600 a year as a money compensation, and is in addition to all living expense while employed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, \$5 a day does not make \$3,600 a year. Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Ten dollars a day, I said; and that is not a high compensation, although it is the largest amount I stated. The gentleman can estimate as well as I can what the living expense of the nurses during their service amounts to, so that compensation in this bill is not high. It is very small compared with what is paid in private life.

But the amendment offered by the lady from Oklahoma does not seek to increase compensation. It seeks to increase the amount allowed for subsistence and for quarters. Nurses of the Army and Navy are, almost without exception, provided with quarters and subsistence at or in connection with hospitals or at other suitable Government buildings; both are provided, so that the salary allowed is clear. Thus they usually have

no expense for quarters or subsistence. But some of them find it necessary to go outside and occupy rooms—rent rooms and pay for them, of course—and provide their own meals. Sixty cents a day is the subsistence that one of these women living outside will receive if this bill becomes law. The lady from Oklahoma asks a moderate increase to \$1.20. The amount allowed for a room or rooms would be \$40 a month under the bill. The lady's amendment would make it \$60 a month. In this city or in a city of any size what kind of a room would a lady get for \$40 a month and live as she wishes to live and as she ought to live? This meager compensation, this inadequate compensation, as I look at it, or the allowance for rooms or for living will not permit nor is it an encouragement to proper living.

Now, I think this Congress wishes to provide for subsistence and for living quarters for these women which are adequate to their needs, and which will provide for and encourage proper and healthful living conditions to them. Forty dollars a month will not pay for a suitable room, nor will 60 cents a day buy even one decent meal. This amendment should be adopted; it will provide \$60 per month for rooms and \$1.20 a day for meals. Smaller amounts will be improper and altogether inadequate and a reproach to the Congress itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the lady from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided and there were—ayes 35, noes 30.

Accordingly, the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 17. That on and after July 1, 1922, retired officers and warrant officers shall have their retired pay, or equivalent pay, computed, as now authorized by law, on the basis of pay provided in this act: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall operate to reduce the present pay of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men now on the retired list or officers or warrant officers in an equivalent status of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act. Active duty performed after June 30, 1922, by an officer on the retired list or its equivalent shall not entitle such officer to promotion. Hereafter retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps below the grade of brigadier general or commodore and retired warrant officers and enlisted men of those services shall, when on active duty, receive full pay and allowances.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday there was an amendment adopted limiting the amount of retired pay. I only ask the chairman of the committee to accept an amendment subject to the same limitations as appear in the amendment already adopted.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am opposed to that, because I was opposed to the other amendment.

Mr. OLIVER. My purpose is just to make it consistent.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would rather try to reverse our action on the former amendment.

Mr. OLIVER. I think perhaps the other amendment covered it, it was so broad; but we can straighten that out in conference.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a perfecting amendment, on page 21, in line 8, to strike out the word "and," at the end of the line, and insert after the word "corps," in line 9, the words "Coast Guard and Geodetic Survey."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LONGWORTH). The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKENZIE: Page 21, line 8, strike out the word "and" at the end of the line and insert after the word "corps," in line 9, the words "Coast Guard and Geodetic Survey."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEAVER: Page 21, lines 7 and 8, after the word "promotion," insert a colon and insert: "*Provided*, That officers and former officers of Philippine Scouts who were placed on the retired list of the Army prior to June 4, 1920, shall, upon the passage of this act, be entitled to advancement for active duty heretofore performed subsequent to retirement in accordance with section 127a of the act of June 4, 1920, and to the same retired pay and benefits received by other retired officers of the Army of like grade and length of service."

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. I will reserve it if the gentleman wishes to explain his amendment.

Mr. WEAVER. I will be very glad if the gentleman will reserve it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does the gentleman's amendment provide that these officers shall be advanced in grade?

Mr. WEAVER. If the gentleman will reserve his point of order, I will explain my amendment.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. All right.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, in the act of June 4, 1920, it is provided that officers in the Philippine Scouts shall be retired upon the same pay and with the same rights of promotion as officers in the Regular Army; but the act provided that as to officers already retired or who had been retired prior to the passage of that act, they should receive the pay of second lieutenants.

Mr. Chairman, there are about 89 of these officers. I think 65 of them are captains. They were the men who really did the arduous service in the Philippines. They were there during the Philippine insurrection. They were the men who helped to quell that insurrection. Yet a Philippine officer retiring now gets the same pay and the same right to promotion that an officer in the Regular Army gets, while those same rights and privileges are denied to the men who served from 1898 up to June 4, 1920. These men feel that that discrepancy was not really intended in the bill, and that it ought to be corrected, and that is the purpose of this amendment.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, by the gentleman's own statement his amendment seeks to perform an act of legislation which is not within the purview of this bill at all. It provides that men who have been in the military service and have been retired heretofore with a certain rank and grade shall be promoted from that rank and grade to a higher one. This bill does not deal with promotions. This bill does not change the grade status of any officer, and has no authority, for it, nor did the committee reporting the bill have any authority whatever to go into that question. This bill deals entirely with compensation. I will say to the gentleman further that while there may be some justice in his proposition—we are not debating the merits of it at all—there is an ample remedy in another vehicle for it; but on this bill it is clearly out of order, and I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not advised as to whether the Philippine Scouts are included in this bill.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The question is simply this: This bill fixes the pay of officers of various services, but does not disturb their relations to one another by way of changing their grade and rank. The gentleman's amendment proposes to take the officers of a certain service and change the grade and rank and give them more pay. To the extent it changes the grade and rank of anybody it is without the jurisdiction and purview of this bill. The Philippine Scouts are not included in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to think that the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina is not covered by the bill, is not germane, and therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 20. That all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of all branches of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, when detailed to duty involving flying, shall receive the same increase of their pay and the same allowance for traveling expenses as are now authorized for the performance of like duties in the Army. Exclusive of the Army Air Service, and student aviators and qualified aircraft pilots of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, the number of officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act detailed to duty involving flying shall not at any one time exceed one-half of 1 per cent of the total authorized commissioned strength of such service. Regulations in execution of the provisions of this section shall be made by the President and shall be uniform for all the services concerned.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. WALSH, Speaker pro tempore, having taken the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10972) to readjust the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, we have now concluded the consideration of this bill, which has taken six months of the most difficult and arduous toil in its preparation. In my judgment it is a day's work that will mean much to the country and much to the services. I feel that in the coming years it will save millions of dollars to the taxpayers of this country, that it will bring satisfaction to the rank and file of the several services affected, and that it will do justice where justice should be done. It puts humanity into

the law which heretofore never had any humanity in it. It provides for the home, wife, and little ones as well as for the officer himself. It will bring a feeling of greater confidence to the men of these services who serve us so well in the hour of stress. I could not, before moving the previous question, resist the temptation to say to the membership of this House that I feel most grateful to you for the manner in which you have supported the committee on this all-important bill. It is a technical bill, full of complications far-reaching in their effects, and as a Member of this House I well know that it was only the confidence that you had in the membership of the committee—that we were trying to do the right thing—that prompted you to follow us in a matter that would have taken weeks and months of difficult study to understand in all of its many details. I want to thank you one and all, and I want to especially express my gratitude to the members of the committee who have aided me in this work, and especially to my good friend Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, who has so ably and earnestly labored with me through these long months.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent, notwithstanding the order of the previous question, that he may proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, there has been no difference between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE] and the minority members of the committee as to the necessity and importance of providing adequate pay for the officer and enlisted personnel in the military branches of the Government. The minority members, for reasons which we think entirely sound and which are fully set out in the minority report, have favored caring for any needed increase in the pay of the officer and enlisted personnel of these services by a temporary rather than permanent bill at this time. The pending bill, we have felt, involving, as it does, many radical and far-reaching changes of existing law, is drafted along illogical and unscientific lines, and in no way simplifies the pay and compensation allowance of the commissioned and enlisted personnel in the services affected, but really serves to add greater confusion and complications to an already very technical subject.

In the coming years I can but feel that many fundamental errors which have found their way into the preparation of this bill will rise to confront us. Too many concessions have been made to remove what the officers, who really prepared this bill, felt might become sources of opposition. A casual reading of section 1 will disclose many concessions, many discriminations, and many gifts of service in present for the purpose of enabling officers to be advanced hereafter to a higher pay period while still holding commissions in a grade lower than such pay period. New rights and privileges are granted to officers now in the service never enjoyed under existing law, and not even remotely promised; and, strange to say, such rights and privileges under the terms of the bill will expire with the officers now in the service. Hereafter the officers who are commissioned, and who really must take the places of the officers now in the service, will be denied the right to claim advancement to pay periods on the same conditions freely granted in the pending bill to the officers now in the service.

When a bill embodies unjust discriminations, makes an unfair distribution of benefits to the personnel of important services, sooner or later these matters come home to confront us in the shape of strong protests and appeals to remedy the wrong. This bill provides one character of service for the officers now holding commissions to advance them to higher pay periods, and denies this right to officers hereafter commissioned. Congress will later be called on to remedy the wrongs thus sought to be perpetuated. Take the commissioned warrant officer. Many of them are now, under existing law, receiving and enjoying pay and allowances of first lieutenants, and yet they, under the terms of this bill, will be forever barred from receiving the pay and allowances of the next higher grade, while officers who hold commissions in this same grade can, under the terms of the bill, use the very character of service that the commissioned warrant officer now has to advance them to the next higher pay period, thereby increasing their base pay \$500, their longevity pay by 50 per cent instead of 40, and also their allowance for subsistence and rentals.

Years of service have been given outright to certain groups of officers by more than one subdivision of section 1. To some officers this gift will immediately advance them to higher pay periods, thereby increasing their base and longevity pay and

allowance. To other officers the gift will become effective after the lapse of further years, but when effective it will serve to immediately advance them to the next higher pay period from that in which they hold commissions, and result in substantial increases in pay and allowances.

You have denied gifts of service to others equally entitled to it; yea, you have not been content with making gifts of service in section 1 of the bill, but you have actually provided that such service could be used not alone as existing law requires—that is, for increasing longevity pay—but under the terms of this bill you permit it to be used to advance these officers to higher base pay on which the increased longevity percentage may be computed.

These rights and privileges, I repeat, are given only to certain groups of officers now in the service, and to be forever withdrawn and denied, by the terms of the bill, to all officers hereafter commissioned.

Mark my prophecy, you are but laying the foundation for future unrest and dissatisfaction in the services. Far better to have waited before writing permanent law until the permanent strength of these services could be fixed and adjustments now pending accomplished, and providing for needed increases by temporary legislation instead. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? A separate vote not being demanded on any amendment, the Chair will put them in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the bill to be engrossed and read a third time.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit:

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas moves to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: "Strike out section 5 of the bill."

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas make the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-one Members present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 41, nays 221, answered "present" 3, not voting 164, as follows:

YEAS—41.

Bell	Driver	London	Stafford
Black	Fulmer	Lowrey	Sumners, Tex.
Bowling	Hammer	Madden	Swank
Box	Huddleston	Oliver	Thomas
Bulwinkle	Jacoway	Parks, Ark.	Tillman
Burness	James	Pou	Weaver
Byrnes, Tenn.	Johnson, Miss.	Quin	Wise
Christopherson	Jones, Tex.	Rankin	Young
Collier	Kraus	Rayburn	
Connally, Tex.	Lanham	Rucker	
Deal	Larsen, Ga.	Sanders, Tex.	

NAYS—221.

Ackerman	Brown, Tenn.	Cooper, Ohio	Evans
Anderson	Buchanan	Cooper, Wis.	Fairfield
Andrew, Mass.	Burroughs	Cramton	Faust
Andrews, Nebr.	Burton	Crisp	Favrot
Anthony	Byrnes, S. C.	Crowther	Fenn
Arentz	Cable	Cullen	Fess
Aswell	Campbell, Kans.	Curry	Fish
Barbour	Cantrill	Dale	Fisher
Barkley	Carew	Dallinger	Fordney
Benham	Chalmers	Denison	Foster
Bird	Chandler, Okla.	Doughton	Free
Bland, Ind.	Chindblom	Drewry	French
Bland, Va.	Clague	Dunbar	Frothingham
Bond	Clarke, N. Y.	Dunn	Fuller
Bowers	Codd	Dupré	Funk
Brennan	Cole, Iowa	Echols	Gallivan
Briggs	Cole, Ohio	Edmonds	Garrett, Tenn.
Brooks, Ill.	Colton	Elliott	Gensman

Gerner	Knutson	Norton	Steenerson
Glynn	Kopp	O'Connor	Stephens
Goodykoontz	Lampert	Ogden	Stoll
Greene, Mass.	Larson, Minn.	Oldfield	Strong, Kans.
Greene, Vt.	Lawrence	Olpp	Swing
Griffin	Lazaro	Overstreet	Tague
Hadley	Lea, Calif.	Padgett	Taylor, Colo.
Hardy, Colo.	Leatherwood	Paige	Taylor, N. J.
Hardy, Tex.	Lee, Ga.	Park, Ga.	Temple
Harrison	Lehlbach	Parker, N. J.	Thompson
Haugen	Lineberger	Parker, N. Y.	Timberlake
Hawes	Longworth	Patterson, Mo.	Tincher
Hawley	Luce	Purnell	Tinkham
Hayden	Luhning	Radcliffe	Towner
Hays	McCormick	Raker	Tucker
Henry	McDuffie	Ramseyer	Tyson
Herrick	McKenzie	Reece	Upshaw
Hickey	McLaughlin, Mich.	Reed, N. Y.	Valle
Hicks	McSwain	Reed, W. Va.	Vestal
Himes	Magee	Rhodes	Vinson
Hoch	Mapes	Ricketts	Voigt
Hooker	Merritt	Riordan	Volstead
Hull	Michener	Roach	Wason
Husted	Miller	Robertson	Watson
Jeffers, Nebr.	Millsbaugh	Robson	Webster
Jeffers, Ala.	Mondell	Rodenberg	Wheeler
Johnson, Ky.	Montague	Rogers	White, Kans.
Johnson, S. Dak.	Montoya	Rose	White, Me.
Johnson, Wash.	Moore, Ill.	Sabath	Williams
Keller	Mott	Sandlin	Williamson
Kennedy	Mudd	Schall	Wilson
Ketcham	Murphy	Scott, Mich.	Woodruff
Kincheloe	Nelson, Me.	Shaw	Woods, Va.
King	Nelson, A. P.	Shelton	Wright
Kinkaid	Nelson, J. M.	Sinclair	Wyant
Kissel	Newton, Minn.	Smith, Idaho	
Kline, N. Y.	Newton, Mo.	Sproul	
Kline, Pa.	Nolan	Stedman	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Lankford	McClintic	RosSDale
----------	-----------	----------

NOT VOTING—164.

Almon	Drane	Kunz	Rouse
Ansorge	Dyer	Langley	Ryan
Appleby	Ellis	Layton	Sanders, Ind.
Atkeson	Fairchild	Lee, N. Y.	Sanders, N. Y.
Bacharach	Fields	Linthicum	Scott, Tenn.
Bankhead	Fitzgerald	Little	Sears
Beck	Focht	Logan	Shreve
Beedy	Frear	Lyon	Siegel
Begg	Freeman	McArthur	Sinnott
Bixler	Gahn	McFadden	Sisson
Blakeney	Garner	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Slemp
Blanton	Garrett, Tex.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Smith, Mich.
Boies	Gilbert	McPherson	Smithwick
Brand	Goldsborough	MacGregor	Snell
Britten	Gorman	Maloney	Snyder
Brooks, Pa.	Gould	Mann	Speaks
Browne, Wis.	Graham, Ill.	Mansfield	Steagall
Burdick	Graham, Pa.	Martin	Stevenson
Burke	Green, Iowa	Mead	Stiness
Butler	Griest	Michaelson	Strong, Pa.
Campbell, Pa.	Hersey	Mills	Sullivan
Cannon	Hill	Moore, Ohio	Summers, Wash.
Carter	Hogan	Moore, Va.	Sweet
Chandler, N. Y.	Hudspeth	Moore, Ind.	Taylor, Ark.
Clark, Fla.	Hukriede	Morgan	Taylor, Tenn.
Classon	Humphreys	Morin	Ten Eyck
Clouse	Hutchinson	O'Brien	Tilson
Cockran	Ireland	Osborne	Treadway
Collins	Jones, Pa.	Patterson, N. J.	Underhill
Connell	Kahn	Perkins	Vare
Connolly, Pa.	Kearns	Perlman	Volk
Copley	Kelley, Mich.	Petersen	Walters
Coughlin	Kelly, Pa.	Porter	Ward, N. Y.
Crago	Kendall	Pringley	Ward, N. C.
Darrow	Kiess	Rainey, Ala.	Wingo
Davis, Minn.	Kindred	Rainey, Ill.	Winslow
Davis, Tenn.	Kirkpatrick	Ransley	Wood, Ind.
Dempsey	Kitchin	Reavis	Woodyard
Dickinson	Kleczka	Reber	Wurzbach
Dominick	Knight	Riddick	Yates
Dowell	Kreider	Rosenbloom	Zihlman

So the motion to recommit was rejected.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gahn (for) with Mr. Goldsborough (against).
Mr. Knight (for) with Mr. Mead (against).
Mr. Linthicum (for) with Mr. Blakeney (against).
Mr. Lankford (for) with Mr. Petersen (against).
Mr. RosSDale (for) with Mr. Crago (against).
Mr. McClintic (for) with Mr. Hukriede (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.
Mr. Treadway with Mr. Cockran.
Mr. McArthur with Mr. Kindred.
Mr. Kiess with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.
Mr. Wurzbach with Mr. Sullivan.
Mr. Winslow with Mr. Bankhead.
Mr. Stiness with Mr. Brand.
Mr. Kendall with Mr. Rainey of Alabama.
Mr. Kahn with Mr. Garner.
Mr. Siegel with Mr. Kunz.

Mr. Layton with Mr. Moore of Virginia.
Mr. Lee of New York with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Appleby with Mr. Dominick.
Mr. Fitzgerald with Mr. Garrett of Texas.
Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Sears.
Mr. Hill with Mr. Blanton.
Mr. Morin with Mr. Smithwick.
Mr. Hutchinson with Mr. Wingo.
Mr. Dowell with Mr. Sisson.
Mr. Atkeson with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. McPherson with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Rainey of Illinois.
Mr. Sanders of Indiana with Mr. Hudspeth.
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Drane.
Mr. Butler with Mr. Logan.
Mr. Osborne with Mr. Campbell of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Coughlin with Mr. Lyon.
Mr. Smith of Michigan with Mr. Gilbert.
Mr. Perlman with Mr. Mansfield.
Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Taylor of Arkansas.
Mr. Shreve with Mr. Fields.
Mr. Patterson of New Jersey with Mr. Ten Eyck.
Mr. Gorman with Mr. Kitchin.
Mr. Connell with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Dickinson with Mr. Humphreys.
Mr. Griest with Mr. Steagall.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Mr. Speaker, I voted aye. I am paired with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Crago, and I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. ROSSDALE was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw my vote of "aye" and answer "present," for the reason that I am paired with the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. HUKRIEDE.

The name of Mr. MCCLINTIC was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. PATTERSON, and wish to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. LANKFORD was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The question is upon the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced the ayes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLACK) there were—ayes 219, noes 26.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Twenty-four gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. MCKENZIE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of self-government in Lithuania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LITHUANIA A REPUBLIC.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania, on whose domain many of the bloodiest campaigns of the World War were waged, has received little attention from the world at large; her sufferings have received scant sympathy and she has bandaged her own wounds. Over the present country of Lithuania, once the largest State in Europe, extending from the Black Sea to the Baltic, the armies of Germany and Russia crossed and recrossed in that war, the Germans frequently raiding the country to capture cattle and the Russians counterattacking to gain immediate results for the moral effect elsewhere. For centuries Lithuania has been in turn the victim of the crushing oppression of Russia and of Germany.

Her masters prevented the Lithuanian people from assembling at public functions. The Lithuanian language, which is said by some philologists to be the oldest living language today, was prohibited in all the public establishments in Lithuania, and it is not difficult to imagine how much unhappiness

and how much disorder such administration brought into the life of a people yearning to be free.

If we but recall that the reading of books written in Lithuanian was forbidden until 1904, we will realize how hard the struggle of these poor people has always been. From 1864 to 1904 they were prohibited from printing even a prayer book in their own language and in the Latin characters. They were persecuted with unspeakable severity for smuggling such publications over the border; their children were compelled to receive instruction in a language that few of them ever understood—these are but a few of the sufferings the Lithuanian people have endured.

Although many of the European nations have recognized the present Lithuanian Government, the United States of America has thus far ignored that young Republic. On the broad issue of self-determination, Lithuania measures up to every principle enunciated by the world's greatest statesmen when the recent war was at its height. If the promises these men made are not forgotten, Lithuania rests confident that her case as presented to the jury of the world will receive that verdict which will strike off her shackles and restore her to the freedom of government and equality among nations.

Many of the principles of its present republican government were borrowed from America. A recent incident in this connection was the presentation by Lithuanians in America of a "liberty bell" to the mother country in commemoration of the fourth anniversary of its independence. The bell is to be rung on all national holidays and days of important historical significance to the country.

The ancient capital of Lithuania's new area, which is slightly in excess of the combined areas of New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, was Vilna, whose narrow and winding streets, stony pavements, and horse-drawn cars give it a quaint and almost medieval atmosphere. Though the seat of its government now is Kovno, many of the great events in its history centered around Vilna.

Vilna was founded at the junction of the Vilna and Vilayka Rivers by Gedimin in 1322, and is connected by railway lines with Petrograd and through Warsaw with most of the capitals of Europe.

When Napoleon passed through the city in 1812 on his way to Moscow the Lithuanian nobles crowded around him, as it was believed he would restore the old Lithuanian State. Near the city to-day there stands a stone which tells the tragic story simply. On the one side it bears the word, "Napoleon Bonaparte passed this way in 1912 with 400,000 men." On the other side there are engraved the telltale words, "Napoleon Bonaparte passed this way in 1812 with but 9,000 men."

I fervently hope that the day is not far distant when America will recognize the new Government so closely patterned after our own.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. KING. To extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the soy bean industry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

THE SOY BEAN INDUSTRY IN AMERICA.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my remarks on the subject of the soy bean industry in America by inserting a letter from Mr. Louis F. King, president of the Tri-County Bean Growers' Association of Illinois, which includes the counties of Schuyler, Hancock, and Adams.

The letter is as follows:

HUNTSVILLE, ILL.

Hon. EDWARD J. KING,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. KING: I am inclosing an editorial clipping from Wallace's Farmer in regard to tariff on tropical fats, as follows:

KEEPING OUT TROPICAL FATS.

It is reported from Washington that the soap and oleo people are making strenuous efforts to put coconut oil, soy bean oil, copra, and other tropical fats on the free list. This is a matter of grave concern to the dairyman, the corn man, the hog man, and the cotton man. Last, but not least, it means much to our infant soy bean industry. Eventually, we should be able to produce soy beans on a large scale more cheaply in the United States than they now do in China, provided we have protection while the industry is young.

All fats are more or less interchangeable and every pound of fat imported from the Tropics influences either directly or indirectly the price of corn, hogs, butter, and cotton.

The soap and oleo people should learn how to utilize home-grown fats instead of tropical fats. They seemed to get along all right with home-grown fats before the war, when we imported only about one-third as many pounds of tropical oils as we have been importing since the war. A tariff of 4 cents a pound on all coconut oil and soy bean oil will teach our manufacturers to depend on the home-grown fats, on the corn oil, lard and soy bean oil, and cottonseed oil produced by American farmers, instead of the coconut oil and soy bean oil produced by low-grade oriental labor. This is a matter of importance to Corn Belt farmers and they should write their Congressmen and Senators at once. The matter of a tariff on vegetable oils will be decided in the very near future, and there is no time to lose.

You will readily understand the object of this editorial. If, as it says, some tariff would be an advantage, do what you can in the interest of the bean business.

We have started an organization to encourage the growing of soy beans, and one thing that will greatly help would be the development of the oil industry in this locality. The acreage will be increased 100 per cent, probably more, this year, especially if the kind of weather we are now having continues. Not an oat has been sown nor a furrow plowed. It is raining all the time.

If it should turn better now not much field work can be done for some time. This condition is likely to result in a large amount of June planting and farmers may be forced to do what they have been slow to undertake—the growing of beans.

Farmers would have been ahead if they had all planted soy beans last year and reduced the corn acreage. From \$20 invested in seed I produced \$232 net profit from beans planted in 30 acres of corn last year.

Up to the present most of the beans grown have been used for seed, but as production increases growers are looking to the oil business for a new cash outlet. This section of Illinois being a live-stock section, beans will soon be used as stock feed, but the beans would make a richer protein food if the oil were extracted. The oil has no particular value as a feed, as we have plenty of that in other things. An oil mill, sooner or later, will be a necessity.

I have an idea that in a few years as large an acreage of beans will be grown as of wheat, aside from what is grown along with corn. The harvesting of beans can be followed immediately with the sowing of wheat, no preparation of seed bed being necessary, and there is likely to be an increased yield of wheat over what a prepared seed bed would give.

Agriculture seems to be commanding more attention from Congress and other interests than ever before. I hope farm organization will continue to progress and avoid any traps that may be laid to defeat the forward movement. I feel that it is important for every farmer to put good management behind his own business and not expect organization and legislation to do it all, although these are very essential.

L. F. KING,

President Tri-County Bean Growers' Association.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. To make a unanimous-consent request to insert in the RECORD a statement from an absent Member, Mr. JOHN W. LANGLEY, as to how he would vote on the Army pay bill if he were present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The telegram is as follows:

LOUISVILLE, KY., May 12, 1922.

I have a general pair with Representative CLARK of Florida, but I want the RECORD to show that I am for the Army pay bill.

JOHN W. LANGLEY.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a brief clipping from the American Lumberman on the Mississippi River.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter is as follows:

TO WHOM DOES THE RIVER BELONG?

The river belongs to the Nation;
The levee, they say, to the State;
The Government runs navigation;
The Commonwealth, though, pays the freight.
Now, here is the problem that's heavy—
Please, which is the right or the wrong—
When the water runs over the levee,
To whom does the river belong?

It's the Government's river in the summer,
When the stage of the water is low,
But in spring when it goes on a hummer
And starts o'er the levee to flow,
When the river gets suddenly dippy
The State must dig down in its till
And push back the old Mississippi
Away from the farm and the mill.

I know very little of lawing,
I've made little study of courts,
I've done little geeing and hawing
Through verdicts, opinions, reports;
Why need there be anything more said
When the river starts levees to climb?
If the Government owns the aforesaid,
It must own it all of the time.

If the bull you are leading should bellow
And jump over somebody's fence,
There isn't much doubt you're the fellow
Expected to bear the expense;
If it follows a Sunday-school teacher
And chases the maid up a tree,
You're the owner the same of the creature
Undoubtedly all will agree.

If some time should somebody's chickens
Get into your garden and dig
And pull up the plants like the dickens,
Or somebody's bull pup or pig,
The owner thereof can not blame it
On you or some party remote;
The owner thereof can't disclaim it—
The chick or the pup or the shoat.

If it's your Mississippi in dry time,
It's yours, Uncle Sam, when it's wet;
If it's your Mississippi in fly time,
In flood time it's your river yet;
There's no other way you can make it;
And so when I give the alarm
Come get your darned river and take it
Away from my timber and farm.
—Douglas Malloch, in American Lumberman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BANKHEAD, for an indefinite period, on account of death in family.

To Mr. COLTON, for two days, on account of important business.

To Mr. WYANT, from May 15 to May 18, on account of official business.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the requirements of section 6 of the trading with the enemy act I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the Alien Property Custodian and a copy of Senate Document No. 181, Sixty-seventh Congress, which document contains a report of all proceedings had under the trading with the enemy act by the office of the Alien Property Custodian during the present administration as well as proceedings under the previous administration from the passage of the trading with the enemy act, October 6, 1917.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 12, 1922.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The message is ordered printed and the document, having already been printed as a Senate document, will be referred to the Judiciary Committee, where the previous message on this subject was referred.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on a matter of the program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, we will take up for consideration to-morrow first the conference report on the Post Office appropriation bill, and we will probably consider also the conference report of the independent offices bill, and probably the conference report of the State and Justice appropriation bill.

On Monday there will likely be some suspensions and the consideration of the Unanimous Consent Calendar. On Tuesday the House will take up the scrapping bill; the scrapping bill will be taken up Tuesday, I think, without question. Following the disposition of the scrapping bill, and without Calendar Wednesday being utilized for Calendar Wednesday business, we hope to take up the river and harbor bill. Among the bills to be considered on Monday will be an appropriation bill making appropriation of \$500,000 for the Department of Justice.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is that one of the suspension bills?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, we will consider that under unanimous consent, if unanimous consent is given. I think that would be better than to consider it under suspension of the rules.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. So far as I know, I have an idea that there will be no objection on this side. The gentleman mentions the suspension bills. Has he any other suspension bills in mind for Monday at present? I merely ask it because Members want to know.

Mr. MONDELL. I think a request will be made for consideration of the bill providing for an additional grand jury for the District of Columbia. Possibly other requests will be made. I am not in position to say now just what the Speaker may determine to do, as that is the Speaker's prerogative. But I hope the Members will be present as far as possible for them to do so.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Saturday, May 13, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

610. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Fisheries, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, for fish-rescue station, Mississippi River Valley, \$60,000, and for salaries for fish-rescue station, Mississippi River Valley, \$15,280; in all, \$75,280 (H. Doc. No. 314) to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

611. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of useless executive papers in files of the Federal reserve banks, the Federal prohibition directors of the various States, the customs service in Juneau, Alaska, and in the office of the custodian at Davenport, Iowa, to be disposed of; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ZIHLMAN: Committee on Labor. H. R. 11155. A bill creating the positions of second assistant secretary and private secretary in the Department of Labor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1003). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. REED of West Virginia: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2919. An act to extend for the period of two years the provisions of Title II of the food control and the District of Columbia rents act, approved October 22, 1919, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 1006). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ROSE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 745. A bill for the relief of William H. Philbrick; without amendment (Rept. No. 1004). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8219. A bill to adjust accounts of Capt. J. S. Carpenter, Supply Corps, United States Navy; with amendments (Rept. No. 1005). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 11233. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land to the county of Muscatine, Iowa; with amendments (Rept. No. 1007). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11602) granting a pension to Parthine Curtis; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9926) granting a pension to Mercia Fox; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 11633) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Middletown, New Castle County, Del.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 11634) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Norman and the town and village of Halstad, in said county, in the State of Minnesota, and the county of Traill and the town of Herberg, in said county, in the State of North Dakota, to construct a bridge

across the Red River of the North on the boundary line between said States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOGAN: A bill (H. R. 11635) authorizing the erection of an addition to the Federal building, Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 11636) to authorize the appointment of stenographers in the courts of the United States and to fix their duties and compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 11637) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to approve indemnity selections in exchange for described granted school lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 11638) granting an increase of pension to Delilah J. Sprinkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11639) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay war risk insurance to the stepfather of Max Wilcox; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 11640) granting a pension to Joseph Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 11641) granting a pension to Mary E. McGill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11642) granting an increase of pension to Susan S. Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 11643) granting a pension to Elizabeth Fenner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROSSDALE: A bill (H. R. 11644) for the relief of Sophie Posner; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5575. By the SPEAKER pro tempore (by request): Resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Hartford, Conn., expressing the desire that the frigate *Hartford* be brought to that city for its final resting place; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5576. By Mr. ANSORGE: Petition of the Five Points Masonic Club, of New York, recommending the passage of the Towner-Sterling bill; to the Committee on Education.

5577. By Mr. CAREW: Resolution adopted by the New York Chapter, Military Order of the World War, urging the Government to conduct periodical training camps for reserve officers and enlisted men; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5578. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the George M. Jones Co., Toledo, Ohio, relative to the existing miners' strike; to the Committee on Labor.

5579. Also, petition of Scarsdale Post, No. 52, Scarsdale, N. Y., relative to the size of the Army; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5580. Also, petition of the Civil Service Forum, New York City, N. Y., relative to House bill 9756; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5581. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of Marion Hitchens and 24 others, of La Moure, N. Dak., in support of House bill 10890; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5582. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of citizens of Gaston, Oreg., protesting against the passage of House bill 9753, to secure Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5583. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of New Bethlehem, Pa., favoring the establishment in Palestine of the national home for the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5584. By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of William Wright and 30 other citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., asking for the passage of the Towner-Sterling educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

5585. Also, petition of I. E. Hawkins, of Portsmouth, Va., and 92 other citizens of the State of Virginia, asking for the passage of the Towner-Sterling educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, May 13, 1922.

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 20, 1922.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

INVITATION TO VISIT QUANTICO (VA.) MARINE CORPS BASE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, which was read and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, May 13, 1922.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: It gives me much pleasure to inform you that the visit of the Members of the Senate to the Marine Corps post at Quantico, Va., which was postponed on account of bad weather, will take place on Thursday, the 18th instant.

The *Mayflower* has been assigned by the President to be used for the trip to Quantico and return, and will sail from the navy yard at 8.30 a. m. on the above-mentioned date.

Will you please bring this invitation to the attention of each Member of the Senate, as I am exceedingly desirous that a large number of the Senators should take advantage of this opportunity to visit Quantico.

With best personal wishes, I am,
Very sincerely yours,

EDWIN DENBY,
Secretary of the Navy.

Hon. CALVIN COOLIDGE,
Vice President of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Treasury Department not needed in the transaction of business and having no permanent value or historic interest, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a joint select committee on the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments. The Vice President appointed Mr. JONES of Washington and Mr. HARRIS members of the committee on the part of the Senate, and ordered that the Secretary notify the House of Representatives thereof.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Saginaw, Grand Rapids, Zeeland, Sebawaing, Unionville, Akron, Pigeon, Bay Port, Gagetown, Bach, Mount Morris, Genesee, Burton, Flint, and Chesaning, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the imposition of a tariff duty of \$2 per hundred pounds on imported Cuban sugar, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SIMMONS presented a resolution adopted by the Negro Teachers' Association of Bertie County, N. C., condemning lynchings for any cause and agitation of the race question and favoring harmony between the races in this country, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LADD presented resolutions of the Kiwanis Club and the Association of Commerce, both of Minot, N. Dak., protesting against repeal or amendment of the transportation act of 1920, and in general against adverse railroad legislation, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Burlington and Weir, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MCKINLEY presented a resolution adopted by the Seventh Annual Convention of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, favoring recognition by the Government of the United States of the Russian Soviet Republic, the Far Eastern Republic, and the autonomous republics carved out of the former Russian Empire, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WILLIS presented the petition of Mrs. Albert Peet and sundry other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for inclusion in the pending tariff bill of only a moderate duty on imported kid gloves, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of C. J. Delong and sundry other citizens of Antwerp, Ira A. Poole and sundry other citizens of Toledo, and A. J. Cowman and sundry other citizens of Rossford, and sundry other citizens of the State of Ohio, praying for the imposition of a tariff duty of \$2 per hundred pounds on imported Cuban sugar, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3461) to amend the act of February 28, 1920, so as to authorize the acquisition of addi-